The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

THESE words are written in a small seaside town in Yorkshire's sleepy East Riding, where we thought to find peace and quiet far from the crowds of men. But all day long there are aeroplanes overhead, often looking beautiful indeed when silhouetted against a fleecy-clouded sky or flashing silver in the setting sun. Firing practice is their frequent occupation, and the rat-tat-tat of machine-guns has become a familiar sound. But why target practice when war is outlawed? Why machine guns? Why these soldiers, mere boys most of them, who parade the promenade or stand and ogle the girls every night?

This week, happily, a raucous roundabout has disappeared; last week it told the world countless times a day in strident discord, that

> There's something about a soldier, there's something about a soldier, there's something about a soldier, that is fine, fine, fine.

In this year of grace 1933, fifteen years after the end of the "war to end war", it sounds like nothing so much as an echo of Tennyson's pageant:

> Form, Form, Riflemen, form!
> Ready, be ready to meet the storm!
> Riflemen, Riflemen, Riflemen, form!

Have we learnt anything? Are we any nearer peace on earth than we were when the century began? Are we doing everything that is possible to abolish war? Are the women of the land? It is as true to-day as when Ruskin spoke the words:

> If it is not yet possible to beat swords into ploughshares it is the fault of the mothers and wives and maidens of England, because no war could continue without them.

Are the Churches? We wonder sometimes if, in regard to peace as in other fields, the time has not come for the Churches to shorten the front of their attack and concentrate on a definite, if smaller, objective. If all the Churches had combined to demand the increase of the school age this year, they might well have succeeded in doing something for the young life of the country, and of considerable effect on the unemployment problem. Whereas they have tried sporadic raids here and there, no doubt helping individual cases, but, it is to be feared, with little permanent effect on the unemployment situation. In the same way, the Churches have been fighting the battle for peace all

along the front, and who will say they have made the least impression on the enemy's lines? If for the next three years the entire forces of Christendom were to concentrate on the effort to eliminate private interest in armaments, would not a great deal more be accomplished?

> The Members of the League agree that the manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objections.

Let the Churches make this declaration of the Covenant their spear-head and press it home to the heart of the vested interests in armaments. The Friends Peace Committee pamphlet, *The War Trade and the Christian Conscience* (6d.) will add power to the thrust.

* * *

It is easy to sneer at Samuel Smiles, and the Mutual Improvement Mechanics' Institute 19th century, but we wonder if the products of the neo-Georgian age come well out of a comparison. Is it fanciful to find Victorian self-help and effort reflected in the sturdy Independency that produced Binney and Baldwin Brown, R. W. Dale and Guinness Rogers, and their like? Then young Congregationalists struggled to the utmost to fit themselves for the ministry; they, and their parents, were prepared to make many sacrifices to secure the best education open to them. The result was men of strong character and vigorous mind, who settled down in their churches and did not seek a change of sphere as soon as difficulties appeared on the horizon. With altogether inadequate stipends they sent their children to Universities from which they themselves had been debarred, and often managed to save—though heaven alone knows how—something for their declining years. There may not have been much beauty about their sermons, but there was strength, and their lives and words counted in the life of the cities and towns where they toiled. Their prayers may have been long, and devoid of anything æsthetic in style and phrasing, but they were their own prayers, interceding with God, even wrestling with Him, for the souls committed to their charge.

To-day, Colleges compete for students, luring them with promises of bursaries which will ease their way through student years. There is less of the seminary about the training, but it is safe to say that there is less hard work, too; in most colleges men can easily take an extra degree on top of their usual course. Not long ago we heard it said that it was impossible for a youth in his teens to take Matriculation in a year, even though he had nothing else to do, and had the coaching the college provided! All we can say is that if the Free Churches are to have ministers who cannot in twelve months' study pass Matriculation, the doom of the professional ministry is nearer than we had thought and hoped. What wonder that such men find three years as long a ministry as they can sustain? What wonder if

ey have so little strength of character that they seek fresh fields and astures new as soon as novelty has worn off, and the real problems of the pastorate become plain? What wonder that books of rayers tumble over each other as they come from the publishers, and at extempore prayer has frequently but a small place in worship? What wonder that such men are always on the doorsteps of the loderators and County Union Secretaries, yearn after Sustentation unds, and seem unable to stand on their own feet? From the ministrial cradle to the grave they are nursed and coddled, bursaried and iperannuated, counselled and "moderated". And with what result? ainly this—that they decide that Congregationalism is an outworn stem, and pine for the protection of a Synod or Conference which all take care of them if evil befall.

Is it not time that these sons of Cromwell were reminded that it was hen the Independents had the courage to be independent that they ade their great contribution to the life of Church and State, here and ross the seas. Their passion for freedom was a consequence of their etermination to be beholden to no man, and, therefore, men the orld over listened to the witness they had to bear. "To be weak is iserable, doing or suffering", and it is because there are so many ho fear to try to stand alone that the miserable spirit of defeatism is oad in many churches. Churches and ministers should serve one nother all they can: the strong must bear the infirmities of the weak; ut for men and churches to rely on help when an effort would enable em to be independent is nothing less than treachery. To those who ink that a lessening of the self-reliant spirit which has been the oud possession of Congregational Churches is going to solve our oblems, the best answer is in the familiar words of our "chief of en", "I beseech you in the bowels of Jesus Christ to think that you ay be mistaken".

* * *

ERHAPS the most incisive thing which has been written on the Oxford ovement during this centenary year is the Rev. J. C. Hardwick's mphlet *The Light that Failed*. To Mr. Hardwick, Keble was "a inty, pious versifier" and "an effeminate", and Pusey "a pedantic ofessor and a timid second-rate mind", and Samuel Wilberforce, of urse, "an opportunist". Those of the Tractarians who did not go Rome were "the victims of an inferiority complex".

> They knew that they were cowards and therefore resolved to act like brave men. When it came to seceding, their courage had failed them; therefore, since they had proved incapable of an act requiring genuine self-sacrifice and fortitude, they would proceed to actions which required an *appearance* of courage . They would, in a word, become ritualists. This new activity served them as a psychological compensation for their lack of genuine courage. The fact that their policy involved breaches of the law, and might even result in prosecutions

> which could be represented as persecution, gave it a sort of pseudo-nobility—a kind of faked martyrdom dear to the romance-loving introvert.

Perhaps, however, the most significant part of the pamphlet is in its exposition of Newman's words. "Depend upon it, the strength of any party lies in its being *true to its theory*. Consistency is the life of a movement". These are words which Congregationalists would do well to remember.

* * *

To Mr. J. Lewis May the great effect of the Oxford Movement was

> to revive the sacramental and symbolical character of religion.

He rejoices in the spectacular element in religion, saying that

> At the Eucharistic Congress in Dublin, the whole world was welcome irrespective of race or creed. At the "Pontifical High Mass" of the Anglo-Catholics to be celebrated in the open air to mark the coming centenary of the Oxford Movement, only communicant members of the Church of England are to be admitted, and they must wear a badge. And, so that it may not be looked upon as a spectacle, it is stipulated that there must be a certain number who will *receive* the communion at the service.

Then he goes on, apparently with no inkling that his words may appear like blasphemy to many,

> But why not a spectacle? Was not Calvary a spectacle? Does it not remain an everlasting spectacle? Is not the Cross on the Hill the sublimest spectacle the world has ever known? And is not the Eucharist the re-enacting of that Sacrifice for all to see? Why, therefore, display it only to the converted? Many who came but to see might remain to pray.

It is true, as St. Paul emphasized more than once, that God placarded Himself before men in the Cross of Christ, making His love so plain that he who runs might read, but this reiterated claim that the Sacrifice is re-enacted in the Mass is both arrogant and repulsive.

And what are we to think of this competition in spectacles that we are witnessing? If the Roman Catholics make a demonstration in Dublin the Anglo-Catholics must show the strength of their forces at the White City. If the Anglicans build a fine Cathedral in Liverpool the Romans must immediately set to work to build bigger and better. And all this in the Name of the Carpenter Who had not where to lay His head. What does He think of the spectacle?

* * *

We do not think it needs any profound measure of insight to see that both in Congregationalism in particular and in Christendom in general, parties are ranging for a critical fight. On the one side will be those who think that the Church of Christ will be saved by the might and power and efficiency of its organization. On the other will be those who believe that organization counts for little, and that if

here is life and faith among Christian people all will be well. On the ne side will be those who lean to the Roman Catholic view of the Church : on the other, those who lean to the Independent and Quaker iew, the former stressing the idea of the Visible Church, the latter hat of the Church Invisible. The first will regard Baptism as the one nd only mode of admission to the Church, which will be dependent pon the existence and ministrations of a clerical class. The other ill hold loosely to the Sacraments, feeling that they—and a ministry -may be necessary and useful, but not essential. Their motto will e, "By their fruits ye shall know them" ; that of the former, "By heir dress and rites ye shall know them".

Some people seem to think that it is Roman Catholic organization hat has kept Christianity alive. Is it not rather the simple faith and evout following of Christ by lowly Christians that have saved the ighty Church from extinction ? In Machiavelli's words :

> The kingdom of the clergy had been long before at an end, if the reputation and reverence towards the poverty of friars had not borne out the scandal of the superfluities and excesses of bishops and prelates.

* * *

HE more two special Sacraments are isolated, the more people try to ake them of the *esse* of the Church, the more do words like these peal :

> We need to give ourselves to the sacrament of daily life, finding the good, the true, the beautiful around us and in other folk. Could we but take this communion of the common life, how it would change our habitual ways of thought and action. We should no longer treat anyone as an inferior; we should find the meanest service which we receive from others or render to them transfigured by the light of that upper room where our Lord and Master washed the disciples' feet. If we really entered into this oneness of a common communion with all our fellow men and with the whole creation, it would mean many a simple but radical change in the ordering of our lives. It would bring us to the place of self-denial which will become the place of insight. As we thus seek to find and serve Christ in His brethren, we shall be granted moments of vision according to our need.

ney come, of course, from the Friends, which is sufficient in itself to ndemn them in the eyes of some. But the question is not whence ey come, but do they show the mind of Christ ? Is there any doubt out the answer ?

* * *

HEN we had read the first chapter of Dr. S. M. Shoemaker's *The nversion of the Church* (Oliphants, 2s. 6d.) we were inclined to think he best book on the Group Movement which had so far come our y. That opinion we still hold, though Dr. Shoemaker at times gets y irritating with his use of Group jargon, patter, and technique.

That the Church spends far too much time in pronouncements, investigations, organizations, social effort, needs to be stressed continually; that, in C. H. Brown's words,

> the Church began to fail when it ceased being a group alert to the purpose of doing Christ's will, and became simply an institution,

we are convinced, as we are that—it is because of this that we believe heart and soul in Congregationalism—

> one of the greatest needs in our day is for the reproduction of Christian groups, united though widely scattered, such as Harnack describes in the early Church.

It is when Dr. Shoemaker, not content to describe the ends and aims of the Church, goes on to proclaim the means with almost the same narrowness as the sacerdotalist that we part company. There is more than the Group door into the Kingdom of Heaven. And with the narrowness goes an arrogance which is to be deplored. Dr. Shoemaker may know "most ministers", but he produces no evidence that "most ministers lend books because they will not share themselves". And certainly we are not prepared, despite precocious and priggish children we have met, to accept without proof this story of a child of nine, even though she "had had an experience of Christ and believed in guidance".

> One day she told her mother that she had had guidance about something. Her mother said, "You mean your conscience told you this." She stopped a minute, and said, "No, Mummy, conscience tells you the difference between right and wrong; but guidance tells you which of several right things you ought to do".

It is about guidance that Dr. Shoemaker is most unsatisfactory. The believer in guidance, he says, has got "above conscience and instinct alike", and is "at the beck and call of the Holy Spirit". We have our doubts about this, even when we recognize the force of the contention that Christians and Churches have become too much like "a dynamo, busy with plans and philanthropy and activity", when they ought to be receiving-sets.

* * *

Often as we listen to preaching from the pulpit, or to those who expound modern theology "over the air", we have the same feeling as when we read the words of some of our would-be mentors—we marvel at their failure to recognize that simplicity is one of the first requisites of the teacher. Often they are expounding ideas that are entirely foreign to many hearers, and yet not only do they employ technical terminology, but their whole diction is sufficient in itself to banish thousands from the churches or drive them to switch off the wireless.

A College Principal of our acquaintance used to exhort his students to speak so simply that the servant-girl in the gallery could understand them. He talked good sense, then as always. Many of

our contemporaries, however, seem to be in love with what Milton called

> swelling epithets, thick laid as varnish on a harlot's cheek;

they love polysyllabic words and rotund phrases, and despise the purity, directness, and simplicity of

> Cover her face; mine eyes dazzle; she died young;

they seem to think they will be heard, by men if not by God, for their much speaking. It is an excellent discipline at times to go through paragraphs prepared for public speech and blot out, not only purple passages, but every word of more than two syllables, or even more than one. Note the way the greatest of teachers went about *His* business:

> Behold, a sower went forth to sow; and when he sowed, some seeds fell by the way side, and the fowls came and devoured them up: Some fell upon stony places, where they had not much earth: and forthwith they sprung up, because they had no deepness of earth: And when the sun was up, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they withered away. And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprung up and choked them: But other fell into good ground, and brought forth fruit, some an hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.

And the common people heard Him gladly.

* * *

We have been interested to contrast two American views of the work of the ministry—perhaps they are not really a contrast. In one of them a layman declared that "the minister's job is the easiest job in the world to 'get by' in and the hardest job in the world to 'make good' in". In the other Dr. George Cable Moore said in the *Churchman* that the qualifications demanded for a city pastor in the modern world are these:

The strength of an ox,
The tenacity of a bulldog,
The daring of a lion,
The patience of a donkey,
The industry of a beaver,
The versatility of a chameleon,
The vision of an eagle,
The melody of a nightingale,
The meekness of a lamb,
The hide of a rhinoceros,
The disposition of an angel,
The resignation of an incurable,
The loyalty of an apostle,
The heroism of a martyr,
The faithfulness of a prophet,
The tenderness of a shepherd,
The fervency of an evangelist,
The devotion of a mother.

BAPTISM—CONGREGATIONAL THEORY AND PRACTICE.

SIXTY years ago Dale said that the whole question of Baptism was in a state of confusion among Congregationalists:

> They believe that infants ought to be baptized, and they protest against the doctrine that all baptized infants are regenerate; on these two points they are unanimous, but here their unanimity ends. There are probably a considerable number of Congregationalists who hold that Baptism should be administered only to believers and their children; the large majority, however, baptize all children that are brought to them, without making inquiry into the faith of their parents. There are some who speak of it as the "sign of the covenant" between God and the baptized child. There are others—probably the most numerous—who regard it as a symbolical rite, in which the parent dedicates the child to God. There are probably very few subjects on which the common thought of intelligent and intellectual Congregationalism is so vague, indefinite, and incoherent.

Sixty years after, I am afraid it must be reported that the state of affairs remains the same, and yet there is a growing conviction that it is time we made up our minds on this question. Its immediate importance has arisen, I suppose, through the discussions that have been taking place with the Baptists in regard to union. But it also closely concerns the larger question of union with other branches of the Christian Church, especially with the Anglican Church. I have long felt that in those discussions the question of Baptism has not received the attention it demands. In the Report of the Joint Conference at Lambeth, signed on behalf of the Federal Council by Dr. J. D. Jones, it is stated that "Baptism is by the ordinance of Christ and of His Apostles the outward and visible sign of admission into membership of the Church". In almost every statement that has been issued on our side the same position is assumed. That Church consists of baptized Christians. On that basis the discussion has proceeded to the questions of ordination and inter-communion. But is that basis secure? Is it agreed amongst us? What would the Anglicans say if they knew that there are probably men who administer the Lord's Supper amongst us who have never been baptized? And that there are certainly more than a few in the membership of our churches who were not baptized as children and have not been baptized as adults? At least they ought to know where we stand.

Not long ago two young women came into my vestry. They belonged to a family which had drifted away from the Church. But they had found their own way to our fellowship and wished to become members. "We have one difficulty that troubles us", they said.

'We have never been baptized. Our parents did not attend any hurch when we were born. Is it necessary to be baptized in order o join the Church and attend Communion?" I said I was perfectly villing to baptize them if they wished it, but that it was not held mong Congregationalists to be essential. Now in saying that I elieve that I spoke for the great majority of Congregationalists o-day. But I confess I was very uneasy in my mind, and I have given nuch thought to it since.

I have been much impressed with the fact that up to the middle of he 19th century the universal belief of Congregationalism was that aptism was the sacrament that accompanied admission into the hurch; that it was to be administered only to believers and their hildren; and, in the early days, that it could only be administered y an ordained minister.

In the *Book which sheweth the life and manners of all true hristians* (1582) Robert Browne says "the sacrament of Baptism" s used "to seal the covenant and conditions" between God and His eople, including "His promise to be the God of our seed, while we re His people". Thus "the children of the faithful, though they be nfants, are to be offered to God and the Church, that they may be aptized". "The sign" being "applied",

> the preacher must pronounce them to be baptized into the body and government of Christ, to be taught and to profess His laws, that by His mediation and victory they, having died unto sin by repentance, might rise again with Him unto holiness and happiness for ever. The church must give thanks for the party baptized, and pray for his further instruction and training unto salvation.

lenry Barrow held the same view. Baptism is the common seal to l that are within the covenant—to the Church and their seed. "None n be a member of a planted Church, but such as are baptized". He so held that only a minister could administer the sacrament.

John Robinson also defended the baptism of the children of be-evers, and held that only a pastor could baptize, though he concedes at when a church is without a pastor it might authorize one of its embers to administer the ordinance. This is important as suggesting e real reason why the early Independents laid such stress on the rule at only a minister should baptize. There is, of course, no sacerdotal plication about it; it is because baptism is the act of the Church, d must be performed by an authorized representative of the Church.

But for 17th century Independency the Savoy Declaration of 1658 the classic document. Baptism, which is to be administered "by a inister of the Gospel lawfully called",

> is a sacrament of the New Testament ordained by Jesus Christ, to be unto the party baptized a sign and seal of the covenant of grace; of his ingrafting into Christ; of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up himself unto God through Jesus Christ to walk in

> newness of life, which ordinance is by Christ's own appointment to be continued in His Church to the end of the world. . . Not only those who actually profess faith in and obedience unto Christ, but if the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized, even those only.

Then follows a sentence in which, as Dr. Bartlet says,

> we see Calvinism qualifying or rather cutting across baptism as something incongruous with the ideas to which it was originally relative.

Dr. Bartlet comments:

> Predestination and baptism are really incompatible, and this helps to explain why baptism has always held a rather superfluous place in Congregational piety, so far as Calvinism was really its work in theology.

But superfluous or not, it is clear that the early Independents held a high doctrine of baptism and regarded it as the seal of the covenant by which believers and their children were ingrafted into the Church the Body of Christ.

Another line of evidence which we too much neglect in these matters, is the witness of our Hymnody. Thus Isaac Watts, standing in the old tradition:

> Now let the children of the saints,
> Be dedicate to God;
> Pour out Thy spirit on them, Lord,
> And wash them in Thy blood.
>
> Thus to the parents and their seed,
> Shall Thy salvation come,
> And numerous household meet at last
> In our eternal home.

We come now to Robert Halley's monumental work on the Sacraments, in 1844, in which he contraverts at enormous and tedious length the position of the Baptists. Dr. Halley entirely rejects the limitation of baptism to the children of believers. His argument is rather vitiated for us by the fact that he bases the whole case for Baptism on the direct commission: "Go ye and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them . . ." "Were this one text obliterated from Scripture", he says, "we should have no divine authority for the administration of baptism". But, accepting this as our commission, he goes on to say that "all the nations" does not exclude infants, therefore they must be included.

> Infants whose parents will not present them for baptism cannot be baptized, but the infants of Christian parents, and of parents willing that their children shall be taught in Christian schools, may be baptized.

In taking this position Halley admits that he is departing from the older tradition, represented by Dr. Owen and Dr. Wardlaw. Owen, he says, held that infants of believers must be baptized because they are in their parents' covenant of grace. But the children of un-

believers are not within the covenant of grace. To which Halley replies, "Do you mean that they are not within the covenant of Christ?" "Dr. Wardlaw", he says,

> restricts the sign, but nowhere restricts the grace of the covenant to one class of believers. Dr. Owen, more consistently, restricts both the sign and the grace; we restrict neither the sign nor the grace.

Now clearly the significance of baptism is here changing. It is ceasing to be the way of entrance into the Church, the seal of the covenant, it is becoming a declaration that all children are within the Kingdom of Christ. We are not surprised therefore to find that Halley makes a distinction between the Church of Christ, and the Kingdom of Christ.

> Were all particular churches dissolved the Kingdom of God would remain; a Kingdom which cannot be removed. Who will say there was no Kingdom of God in Britain until Robert Browne gathered a Congregational Church? . . . Is not baptism the proper recognition of a member of Christ's Kingdom?

We admire the modesty of this admission, but is it relevant to the question of baptism? If this is what baptism means, a recognition that all children are within the Kingdom and love of Christ, would it not be better to rest it on the words of Christ, "Suffer the little children to come unto me", than urge the baptismal commission, which Halley tells us is the only justification for baptism at all? This, in fact, is just what we find. More and more at this period, it is the words of Christ blessing the children which are quoted in relation to baptism. Again we call our Hymns to witness. In the *New Congregational Hymn Book* (1859) we find this is the case.

> He Who a little child began
> The life divine to show to man,
> Proclaims from heaven the message free,
> Let little children come to me.
>
> We bring them, Lord, and with the sign
> Of sprinkled water, name them Thine.

From Halley we turn to Dale, and find that he held the same view in a more accentuated form. In 1873 Dale published a series of articles in *The Congregationalist* on "The Relation of Children to the Church". A paper read under this title at the Autumnal Meetings at Leeds a few years before had led to a good deal of discussion and controversy in the religious papers. The question was raised whether the Church was doing its duty by its children, and the position was taken by many that baptism itself really meant admission to the Church. "We who baptize infants", it was said,

> should regard the baptized children of Church members as themselves also members with us. By virtue of that organic oneness with their parents, by an act of piety and of faith on the part of those parents, they have already been received within the outer circle and gate of the

> Church. They have been recognized and accepted as belongin[g] Jesus.

Now this was evidently a return to the traditional view. O[ne] writer quotes the Westminster Confession while pleading also for [the] wider view represented by Halley, that baptism is a token of [a] covenant already existing between the recipient and God, and a se[al]ing of the same before witnesses. "Every human being therefo[re] being in the covenant, is entitled to the token of it, and it should [not] be refused by whomsoever claimed". Dale seizes upon the inco[n]sistency of this with the older view.

> The Westminster Confession rests upon the hypothesis that th[ere] is a special covenant between God and the children of believers, [to] which Baptism is the sign and seal. The broader view absolut[ely] ignores, in relation to Baptism, any distinction at all between the ch[il]dren of believers and the children of unbelievers; declares that t[he] privileges and blessings represented and conferred by the rite are t[he] common inheritance of all who are born into this world.

Between these two views Dale chooses decisively the broader inte[r]pretation of Baptism. He utterly repudiates the idea that Baptis[m] means admission into the Church. "Not a shred of argument c[an] be produced in its favour". And yet he admits that the theory th[at] children are by baptism made members of the Church is almost u[n]versally held throughout Christendom. This he admits is a stro[ng] argument in its favour.

> Whenever a church stands alone, with all the rest of Christend[om] against it, there seems to be a prior probability that it is in the wro[ng].

On this question, he says, we have Rome against us; we have t[he] Eastern Church against us; we have the Lutheran Church agai[nst] us; we have the Westminster Confession against us; we have t[he] Baptists against us. This is a formidable consensus of opinion [for] one who admits that

> Whenever a church stands alone, with all the rest of Christend[om] against it, there seems to me a prior probability that it is in the wro[ng].

To that formidable list we may also add that we have against [us] our own pious founders and fathers. How then does Dale defe[nd] this isolation? In this way.

> The Churches which regard Baptism as admission into the Churc[h] generally assert that in the rite of Baptism spiritual grace is bestowe[d] on the recipient, and so long as we are compelled to deny the spiritual efficacy of the rite, we need not be troubled that we are isolated fro[m] them in denying that the rite confers Church Membership.

But in saying this, does not Dale go a little too far? It is tru[e] that we entirely repudiate the mechanical view of grace as something infused at Baptism; it is true we reject the doctrine of baptismal re[-] generation. But do we deny that the rite has spiritual efficacy? I[s] it not indeed the chief value of baptism that it emphasizes the idea o[f]

ne Church as a means of grace? Dr. Forsyth is quite clear about nis:

> What Baptism first means is the incorporation of the baptized into the Church, to which the evangelical promise is chiefly made and the Spirit given. He is entered of the Church especially as it is the social body of Christ, as the spiritual organism of history, as the soul's moral home and nursery.

To Dale, baptism is simply a declaratory act.

> Our baptism is the visible revelation of the great fact that we belong to a race for which Christ died. Every child born into this world is born a subject of Christ. The children of Church members and the children of those who live in the open neglect of all the institutions of public worship, the children of saints and the children of blasphemers, they are all dear to the heart of God.

'hen he makes a significant admission.

> The significance of the ordinance is, if possible, more obvious when administered to a child than when administered to an adult. In the case of an adult it would be contrary to the whole spirit of the Christian Faith that Baptism should be administered without the free consent of the baptized person, and the fact that that consent is necessary is likely to obscure the real meaning of the rite. In the case of a child there is nothing to impair its force and to perplex its meaning.

Now this seems to me a significant and damaging admission. For irely, whether or not infants were baptized in Apostolic times, there in be no doubt that early baptism was primarily intended for adults. is generally agreed that much of the confusion about baptism has isen over the fact that the meaning attached to it in the case of adults is been too literally transferred to the baptism of infants. But to verse this process, to interpret adult baptism in the light of its significance for children, is to do great violence to tradition and to the ew Testament.

The whole question seems to turn on Dale's assumption that to id a spiritual efficacy in baptism is to imply the theory of baptismal generation. But this is due rather to Augustine's theory of original n. It was not the doctrine of original sin which gave meaning to fant baptism in the apostolic age. It was the conception of the lidarity of the family. I am aware that the Baptists deny that such idence is to be found in the New Testament. But I will content myf with quoting Dr. Bartlet on this point. He admits that there is positive or explicit trace of infant baptism in the first century, but e argument from silence is, he considers, conclusive:

> The Jewish antecedents of the apostles being what they were, the presumption is that they would baptize the children of believers, as *ipso facto* sharing in the life of the Church—standing in New Covenant relations with God into which their parents had entered by faith and baptism. . . . The idea that a parent, especially the paterfamilias, should stand in a religious relation to God as an individual merely, *i.e.*, by himself as distinct from his own flesh and blood would never occur to the ancients, least of all to a Jew.

I think we may claim with confidence that this view—that, in words of Dr. Anderson Scott,

> In Baptism God draws man to the family with a gift of grace, through the family to its infant members, who through the Sacrament become members also of the visible Church—

is universally held by the Reformed Churches. The two chief objections are from the Baptists and the Friends. Here again I beg leave to quote Dr. Bartlet—in a pamphlet which has never been published—

> The essence of the Baptist position is that only believer's baptism, the sign sealing faith existent in the subject of the rite, is Christian baptism at all; the Friends go further, and deny that any outward sign or seal is in place in the New Covenant as the dispensation of the Spirit. As between the two positions Biblical criticism has greatly strengthened that of the Friends, by making doubtful Christ's own institution of Christian Baptism, so changing the question from one of loyalty in the Founder's law, into one of the expediency of continuing a rite of the apostolic age beyond that age. On the other hand, the Friends' own dualism between the inward and the outward, spirit and sense, is one which is increasingly felt to be largely artificial and one-sided. Some symbolism is a help rather than a hindrance to the great majority. . . . In a word, the Baptist position is weakened by historical progress, that of the Friends by philosophical.

To sum up: it must be admitted that in recent years the practice among Congregationalists has been based on Dale's theory, that baptism is simply a declaration that every child is a child of God. I remember the late Alexander Sandison, that dear saint, saying to me: "I could no more refuse to baptize a baby than I could refuse to kiss it". Baptism is the kiss of God, a benediction by the Church in the Father's Name. And yet, in accepting that view we stand alone in Christendom. And there is an increasing number who hold the traditional view of baptism who reject with us the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. There are signs among us of a move toward the older tradition. I must confess that I have a good deal of sympathy with a tendency that would bring us into closer harmony with the rest of Christendom. But one or two questions arise.

The first is this—how far are we to adhere to the principle that only the children of believers should be baptized? Are we to refuse others that are brought to us? Must we not in such cases enquire into motive? If it is a mere superstition—a concession, it may be, to those who teach what seems to us a mechanical view of grace—this surely we ought at least to make it properly clear that we hold no such view. But in the majority of cases may we not assume that the desire for baptism means a sincere desire that the child should belong to the household of faith? In such cases should we not try to persuade the parents that they ought themselves to claim their inheritance with the saints? But a more important question is raised. The real weakness of our present position is that it takes so little notice of the child after

aptism. Would it not be an excellent custom to send every child a ard on its baptismal anniversary? And surely the Church should now the reason why, if the child does not in later years make on its wn behalf the vows that were made for it at its baptism. In the resbyterian Book of Common Order, there is an excellent form of ords to be addressed to those joining the Church:

> Dear Brethren, you are not now for the first time to be admitted to the fellowship of the Church. You were received into it at Baptism, in which the Lord Jesus offered to you the rights and privileges of the children of God, pledging Himself to fulfil His promises as soon as you should turn to Him in faith.

But the most difficult question is how far baptism is to be made a ondition of Church membership. The question is one of great im- ortance when we are discussing reunion. Suppose the Anglicans ade proposals for inter-communion. They would be horrified at e suggestion that an unbaptized person should receive the Sacra- ent of the Body of Christ. Yet how many of us ever ask when we arry the living or bury the dead, were they baptized? Mr. B. L. anning has recently expressed his mind on this question.

> I believe that I have the great body of Congregational opinion against me, but candour compels me to say that on the one occasion when this question came before me as an ordinary church member, I was quite unable to vote for the admission of such persons. Not because I want a sacramental test, but because if the Good News and the Fellowship stand in such relation as I believe they do, I simply do not know what is meant by proclaiming the most intimate fellowship with persons who announce that the Good News in its best form has not reached them[1].

To some of us it is rather a question of the Good News being too od to be confined to certain channels however sacred through usage d tradition.

For myself I can only say that so long as the detestable doctrine baptismal regeneration in its Romish form is widely held and ught by a great section of Christendom, I cannot myself insist on the necessity of Baptism. It seems to me that here as so often ngregationalism represents a real *via media*—combining as we do igh doctrine of the sacraments with a voluntary use of them. But t being said, I cannot but welcome any movement which brings us o closer harmony with the universal Church.

In his chapter on Baptism in his classic work, *Christian Institu- ns*, Dr. A. V. G. Allen says:

> There are two features or institutions of Christianity which, more than any others, reveal its meaning and purpose—the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. They stand forth as monuments against the Christian horizon at every point of time and space, even across the space of eighteen centuries . . . the water standing for

1 *Congregational Quarterly* XI. 163.

> purification, the bread and the wine for the sustenance of life: hu ity purifying itself in order to sit at the banquet of the Eternal. these sacraments, in the successive eras of history, men have read hopes, and their fears, their aspirations, till they have become maries of the Christian life.

Is it not profoundly significant that these two sacraments have b thus preserved through the centuries, and that in them the thou of Christendom has found expression "ere thought could wed it to speech"? Does it not suggest that in them the genius Christianity is contained?

And yet it would be better to abandon Baptism than to give t a meaning which is entirely different from the meaning given t throughout Christendom. To use it as a mere service of dedication to preserve nothing but the outward rite, and to use symbols wh have ceased to have any relevance at all. To use it as a declarat act has neither the authority of Scripture nor the sanction of traditi Behind all the varieties of interpretation Baptism symbolizes genius of Christianity in a two-fold way. That Christianity is ess tially a religion of grace; it is a gift of God; and that the Christ life is life in a community. To say that Baptism is a declaration t he that is of the world and he that is in "the household of faith" equally and in the same sense the children of God, is to reverse meaning. Baptism is a symbol of the unspeakable privilege of be numbered among those who have been "delivered out of the powe darkness, and translated into the Kingdom of the Son of His lov

K. L. Parry

CHARLES BRADLAUGH.

Charles Bradlaugh walked all his life on the edge of tragedy. His home was shadowed, he was the chosen target for slander, he was continually entangled in litigation and burdened with debt; and, just as the tide was turning and bearing him towards recognition and popularity, he died broken by his life-long struggle. But out of pathetic circumstance looms an heroic figure. Now that the dust of controversy has blown away, his character and work are seen to bear the stamp of a noble sincerity.

Charles Bradlaugh was born at Hoxton on 26th September, 1833. After a meagre education he began work, at the age of twelve, as errand-boy for a firm of solicitors. So eager was he to buy books that he would run his long-distance errands to save omnibus fares, and walk round by London Bridge to save toll. The crisis of his life came before he was fifteen. He was then attached to the church of St. Peter's in Hackney Road, and had shown such promise as to have been made a Sunday School teacher. Invited to prepare for Confirmation, he set himself to study the four Gospels and the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. Unable to reconcile the two, he wrote in his perplexity to the incumbent, the Rev. J. G. Packer, who, shocked at this evidence of youthful scepticism, suspended him from teaching for three months, and wrote a scathing letter to his father.

Charles's break with the Church was soon followed by his break with the Christian faith. He got into touch with free-thinkers, at first arguing the orthodox position against them, but finally persuaded, by debate and reading, into atheism. His parents, led by Mr. Packer, turned against him, and treated him harshly; his employers dismissed him because of his change of faith.

Now came two years of strenuous study, under conditions of physical hardship. He continued his researches into Christian theology, and took an eager part in debate. The subject of his first lecture, given when he was seventeen, was "The Past, Present, and Future of Theology". The omniscience of youth! But the prejudice against his views made it impossible for him to earn a living. Half-starved, and with a little sea of debt rising around him, he was driven to enlist, and was drafted to Ireland. A legacy left by an aunt made possible his discharge, and, returning home in his twenty-first year, he soon afterwards married. That proved a tragedy. His wife, though a fine woman in many respects, took to drink, and after some years of unhappiness Bradlaugh was compelled to break up his home and live apart from her.

Ill-luck still pursued him. For several years he was engaged in law-work, under various solicitors, but all his efforts to win his articles were thwarted. The experience he gained, however, proved very useful to him in fighting his own law-suits. Many tributes were paid by judges to the skill with which he conducted his cases; had he become a barrister, he would undoubtedly have had a distinguished career. Afterwards he went into business in the City, but with moderate success.

* * *

Charles Bradlaugh was the most militant and effective advocate of free-thought of his generation. All his life he lectured regularly in-doors and out-of-doors, both in London and in the provinces. His provincial work cost him dearly in hardship and sacrifice. He frequently spent Saturday and Sunday nights in the train (no luxury in those days!), and delivered three lectures meanwhile; and when, as sometimes happened, inclement weather, irregular meals, and rough handling by the mob were added, it was a great tax on the strength even of a strong man.

Bradlaugh swayed his audiences with almost irresistible power. His voice, somewhat raucous at first but mellowing as he continued and developing great qualities of tone, was suited to the command of vast crowds. It was the fashion to charge him with violence and vulgarity of speech. Hard hitting is apt to seem offensive to those whose opinions are being smitten; and a speaker, attacking the established faith, cannot avoid the appearance of coarseness, and even blasphemy, to those who substitute emotions and prejudices for reason. When a profession of atheism was regarded as *ipso facto* proof of moral baseness, evidences of it were naturally seen in expressions that would have passed unchallenged in another cause. Considering the nature and conditions of Bradlaugh's propaganda, he was singularly free from violence and vulgarity.

His public debates on religion, though they drew huge crowds of people, were not of much intrinsic value. Some of the champions of orthodoxy were earnestly incompetent; some used their cleverness to excite the prejudices of the audience rather than to prove their case; only occasionally was he privileged to meet men who, both by gift and by grace, were worthy to defend their faith.

The opposition to Bradlaugh took various forms. His meetings were upset, mob violence was directed against him and his followers, the local press was often scurrilous in its references to him, and strenuous and crooked attempts were made to prevent his securing a hall in which to speak. A poisoned weapon often used against him was the baseless insinuation that his advocacy of atheism paid him well, and that he would quickly transfer himself to orthodox platforms if it were made worth his while. In towns where his advent raised

storm, the opposition usually died down on subsequent visits, and he held crowded and orderly meetings.

In his propaganda Bradlaugh supplemented voice by pen. Here he was not so successful. The *National Reformer*, which he edited, was the literary medium through which his views were expressed and his personal defence made. In 1868 the Government began a prosecution of him for blasphemy. It dragged on for four years, and ended in a virtual victory for Bradlaugh. It is informing to discover that, had the paper been sold at sixpence instead of twopence, there would have been no ground for action. Blasphemy was only criminal when addressed to the workers!

Bradlaugh won many disciples. To thousands of Lancashire and Yorkshire factory workers he was known as "t'lad", because of his boyish appearance when he first went amongst them; and they would walk long distances to hear him and grasp his hand. He spoke year after year at the great Northumberland and Durham Miners' Galas. To these hard-headed sons of toil he was a knight-errant, fighting to free them from bonds of tradition and serfdom, appealing to the finest qualities of their manhood; and again and again they subscribed out of their scanty wages to help his election campaigns, or to meet the expenses of his costly law-suits.

Bradlaugh made no contribution to the development of philosophic doctrine. His role was to popularize, not to create. But wide reading and deep reflection on the problems of philosophy lay behind his preaching of atheism. Flint, in *Anti-Theistic Theories*, says:

> There is an impression in some quarters that atheism is advocated in a weak and unskilful manner by the chiefs of secularism. It is an impression which I do not share. Most of the writers who are striving to diffuse atheism in literary circles are not to be compared in intellectual strength with either Mr. Holyoake or Mr. Bradlaugh.

Spinoza was his father in philosophy. Bradlaugh took that further step, which some contend cannot be logically avoided, from pantheism to atheism. Spinoza acknowledged only one Substance, with infinite attributes, giving to it the name of God. Bradlaugh accepted his idea of one Substance, but demurred to the infinite attributes. Attributes, he held, can only be postulated of the finite and conditioned. An infinite intelligence is unthinkable. Büchner, the German materialist, was his elder brother in philosophy. They both recognized no existence save matter—matter, indeed, being simply the ground or basis of phenomena, holding in its womb every quality, physical, vital, or mental, that becomes manifest.

Among the idols against which "Iconoclast" swung his heavy hammer was the Bible. He had a scholar's respect for that book as a collection of ancient literary documents: it was the theory of its divine authority that he attacked, on the ground that it made the Bible

the enemy of truth and a drag on progress. It is interesting to spe late to what extent Bradlaugh's views would have been modified i he lived two generations later. His criticisms of the Bible were cog against those who regarded it as the literal word of God, but higher criticism has drawn their sting. The scientific and histor inaccuracies, the moral blemishes, of the Bible find natural expla tion in our modern view, and do not affect its real sacredness a authority. A recognition of this change of front on the part Christian scholars would have made this part of Bradlaugh's pole unnecessary; whether it would have affected his own evaluation the Bible is another matter.

Bradlaugh repudiated theism on scientific grounds, and the o look of science has changed since his day. In the latter half of t nineteenth century science was frankly materialistic. The world w a huge machine; if some parts of it could not be fitted into t machine, that was due to our ignorance. The growth of knowled meant the fitting of piece after piece into its appropriate place; a when the process was completed there would be no unexplain residuum—the spiritual would be clearly seen as only a form of pression of the material. Science has now lost that simple determi world. Matter, ever more and more finely analysed, has become tenuous as almost to have disappeared. Scientific "laws", such "the conservation of energy", that were regarded as impregnal have been undermined. It is possible that, had the young ex-sol been groping to-day for philosophic foothold, he would not h found the rock of materialism so secure.

To Bradlaugh it seemed axiomatic that whatever crops out i expression in the universe must be germinally there already. (Ma modern thinkers are partial to a more adventurous universe). In s of the invincible dualism of the world within human experience, mind lusts after unity. But it is surely as easy and as scientifi reach monism by regarding matter as a mode of soul, as by regard soul as an evolutionary product of matter. Consciousness, inte gence, love, being now parts of reality, must eternally have beer some form within the universe, said Bradlaugh. From that adm sion it does not seem a long leap to a theistic creed.

Whether a man will take the leap or not depends largely on t value he attaches to the facts of religious experience. Pure ration ism (if there is such a thing) neither proves nor negates God. As t atheist says, God is the projection of man's own personality on t screen of eternity. The God-idea is born of human need. But th is no disproof of its truth or value. The question still remains—i the figure that a man sees, and labels "God", a mere figment of l own fancy, or is it a photograph, however imperfectly taken by t imperfect lens of his own mind?

There is virtue in all honest grappling with ultimate problems. Bradlaugh awoke in many thousands of minds a vigorous interest in these problems, and if it led most of them into atheism, that is surely better than a moribund faith or intellectual apathy. Bradlaugh was a revivalist: wherever he went he left men discussing God and the Bible and immortality; he brought them a sort of salvation, though not the orthodox sort; he taught them to see the royalty of truth, and to strive for intellectual consistency.

* * *

In the centenary celebrations it is Bradlaugh, the brave champion of human rights, that will be remembered. With the passing of controversy, the mist of prejudice no longer hides the splendid figure of the reformer. Yet his life was all of a piece—set to the keynote of freedom. He was the friend of all oppressed peoples, at home or abroad; and Italy, France, Spain, Poland, India, and Ireland all owe a debt to his memory.

After three unsuccessful attempts, covering a period of twelve years, Bradlaugh was, in 1880, elected Junior M.P. for Northampton. Then began the long struggle with the House of Commons over the seat he had won. The point at issue was this: a member could not be recognized until he had taken the oath, and Bradlaugh was refused the right to swear on the insulting ground that a religious oath would not bind the conscience of an avowed atheist. After six years of continuous battling, during which he was repeatedly re-elected by the citizens of Northampton—years marked by many painful scenes in Parliament, culminating in the disgraceful incident when he was violently ejected from the House by policemen and attendants—the matter was settled very simply. Mr. Peel, the new Speaker, ruling out any interference, permitted Bradlaugh to take the oath. Five years later, when Bradlaugh lay dying and unconscious of what was transpiring, the House of Commons showed its contrition, and made belated redress, by expunging from its Journal the resolutions of previous years excluding him.

A follower of Malthus, Bradlaugh incurred great prejudice by advocating the limitation of the family. In 1887 Mrs. Besant and he were prosecuted for selling Dr. Knowlton's pamphlet, *The Fruits of Philosophy,* which contained physiological details held to be indecent. Legal actions and judgments on indecency are difficult to understand. The recognized principle appears to be that very wide latitude may be allowed when the purpose is mere entertainment; but when the purpose is to spread the knowledge of important natural facts, action must be treated as criminal. The first verdict of "guilty" was quashed on appeal.

Bradlaugh belonged to the extreme left-wing of the Liberal pa
By conviction he was a Republican. Though he held what were
garded as dangerous views on such subjects as the House of Lo
and land and taxation, he was a strong opponent of the Socia
Movement, then beginning to capture certain sections of the thinki
public. While eager for radical measures, he was prepared to ta
half-a-loaf rather than go without bread; and he felt that the Socialis
were drawing away the energies of the workers from practical refo
to utopian theorizing. In the clash between the opportunist and t
idealist, commonsense is always on the side of the former; but
commonsense the highest court of appeal? Bradlaugh's social phil
sophy was rigidly individualist, and he failed to see the immen
power of the forces that were breaking down individualism, and t
direction which the social movement must take if civilization we
not to end in chaos.

In his brief Parliamentary life Bradlaugh did fruitful work, a
impressed himself on the House; although he never got quite fr
from the incubus of his theological opinions, he won not only resp
but also a measure of popularity. Before his death it was being fre
said that the next Liberal administration must find a place for hi
however keenly his inclusion might be resented in certain quarte

* * *

Of commanding appearance, over six feet in height and p
portionately broad, Bradlaugh had an iron constitution and ext
ordinary muscular strength. This was a tremendous asset to hi
enabling him to do a volume of work that would have killed
ordinary man, and to cope with physical opposition when, as of
happened, it appeared in his meetings. On one occasion he evic
three medical students at once, and they were helpless in his s
grip. He several times silenced the swagger of the local "stro
man". On that terrible day when he was thrown out of the Ho
of Commons by its own order, it took fourteen men to eject hi
and he was then long past his prime.

Bradlaugh's career shows a remarkable consistency. That is n
in itself a virtue. Some men find themselves through rapid and e
treme re-adjustments, while some remain always the same throug
sheer stupidity. In Bradlaugh's case consistency was due to
cautious and well-balanced mind. His growth was always in the sa
direction. Possessing an iron will, he never lost control of himse
and he could hold in check the passions of his followers. There we
occasions—notably that of his forcible expulsion from the Hous
watched by thousands of excited and indignant admirers—when
gesture from him would have let hell loose. But passion never u
seated his judgment.

In mind, as in body, Bradlaugh was built on big lines, and his outstanding qualities were courage and magnanimity. His life throughout was one of conflict, not because he had a temperamental bias to contradiction, but because, notwithstanding that his convictions chanced to be unpopular, he dared to avow them, and to fight for truth and right as he conceived them. The temptation of the man who is brave enough to face persecution in loyalty to conscience is to become bitter, and to pay back his abusive opponents in their own coin. Bradlaugh was above such littleness. Lied about and slandered as he was, he never himself descended to mere mud-slinging. He could easily forget an injury, but the loving sacrifices of his followers, or any generous gesture of an opponent, he never forgot. Personal considerations were not allowed to deflect him from the line of his conviction. When it was suggested that, had the women of Northampton had the vote, he would not have been elected, he replied, "If I were in the House of Commons I should vote for woman suffrage, even if I were sure that I should in future be excluded by women's votes". In the six years during which he was refused his seat in the House, the Irish members were conspicuous by the virulence of their opposition to him. But that fact did not weaken his advocacy of justice for Ireland, on the platform and afterwards in Parliament.

Of Hankin, the atheistical shoe-maker, Snarley Bob said that he spent his breath in proving that there was no God, and his life in proving that there was. Bradlaugh would not welcome such a tribute to himself, but . . . . . it would be true.

E. B. Storr.

PUBLIC WORSHIP.

RELIGION is deep-set in the nature of man. Much of it is individ and secret and will evade scientific investigation. But much is pub expressing the common needs of the human heart. The pub expression of religion in organization and worship is not an entir reliable guide to the inner reality but is an essential part of religio experience and demands the attention of all Christian people.

Prayer is a natural attitude of the human heart, but the history men's attempts to pray together has been marked not only by diversi but also by much that is now revolting. The soul's aspirations ha often been perverted by ignorance and superstition, and altars a temples have been covered in blood or associated with immoralit The form of worship will depend upon a people's conception of Go If He is thought of as an evil spirit or an arbitrary monarch, men w fear Him but they will not come before Him with gladness. If He thought of as the incomprehensible Mystery or merely as the L imprisoned within the material universe, men may bend the knee reverence but they will not love. And God has been conceived in possible ways from the crudest animism to the most abstr philosophy; hence the history of worship includes everything fr savage rites to the purest contemplation and the most intim communion.

We are concerned here particularly with Christian worship more especially with the forms and beliefs of Congregationalists, we begin by reporting that there is amongst us no mood complacency. In common with other branches of the Cath Church we are conscious of defects, and experiments are being n in liturgies and orders of service which indicate dissatisfaction w traditional methods. It is necessary to understand the princi behind these traditional methods and to enquire how far the propo changes are incompatible with them.

There are certain principles upon which Christian people agreed. We are agreed that in worship man brings his offering God, and, whether the offering is thought of in terms of pries sacrifice or as the homage of "a broken and a contrite heart", it i duty each man owes to his Creator. The one thing we must ins upon is that Judaic conceptions of God and approach to Him m not be permitted to distract from the revelation of the Fatherho which we have in Jesus Christ.

We are agreed, further, that worship is a testimony to the wo of the faith that is in us, a witness that is particularly important pagan countries and in times when men become indifferent to claims of religion. It is not only common worship that we offer public worship. It is a social as well as a religious duty.

We are agreed, again, that worship is a means of grace. When men worship in spirit and in truth something happens to them. A reflection of the heavenly splendour shines in them. The mind is illumined and secret things are revealed. Burdens are removed or grace to carry them is received. The peace that passes understanding possesses the heart. Worship is therefore a duty and a privilege that each man owes to himself.

But when we pass beyond the first principles we pass to differences and apparent confusion. How little there is in common between the High Mass of the Roman Catholic, the preaching service of the Congregationalist, and the silence of the Friends' Meeting! How little there is in common between the orderliness of Anglican Matins and the fervour of the Salvation Army or the spontaneity of some evangelistic missions! But, then, how diverse is human nature, and how impossible that all temperaments and mentalities should be satisfied with the same religious forms! And this apparent confusion can be grouped and classified and ultimately reduced to two main types—the priestly and the prophetic. One is distinguished by the prominence of the altar, the other usually by the prominence of the pulpit. One is popularly called "Catholic"; the other "Protestant". The first makes a strong appeal to the natural man and is never likely to be eradicated. The second meets a strong and deep need and seems to be necessary to the maintenance of pure religion.

It is frequently assumed that the second type came into existence with the Protestant Reformation. It would be wiser to connect it with the prophetic religion of the *Old Testament*, which was so often in conflict with the priestly. It is not accurate to regard this as a conflict between the essentially good and the essentially bad. It was part of the perennial conflict between the reformer and the constitutionalist, the idealist and the legislator. The prophet loved truth and hated pretence and feared not any man, though he wore a crown or a mitre, but he was apt to be iconoclastic and to destroy more than ought to be destroyed. The priest easily became conventional and even worldly, substituting the form for the reality, but he knew the value of legal authority, symbol, ritual, and suggestion. But the contrast was not always as sharp as that. There were priests with prophetic qualities and prophets (like Ezekiel) with priestly affinities.

It is equally important to consider the types of worship found in Palestine when Jesus Christ was born in Bethlehem of Judea. Priestly religion was represented in the ornate Temple with its many courts and altars and sacrifices, and its twenty-four courses of priests. Everything was as lavish and impressive as men knew how to make it, and while the Temple stood it was regarded as the centre of the national life. But even more significant was the synagogue, which, if too legalistic to be true to the prophetic religion, represented it in

its simplicity and intimacy. Rabbis were in charge, but they mig[ht] invite any suitable visitor to read and expound the Scriptures whi[ch] were the chief parts of the worship.

The Temple figures but slightly in the life of our Lord. He w[as] taken there as an infant, according to custom; He taught in t[he] precincts the crowd which assembled there; He cast out those wh[o] bought and sold in the Court of the Gentiles; but there is no eviden[ce] that He ever participated in public worship there. Sometimes H[e] seemed to disparage the whole system. He referred to Himself a[s] greater than the Temple; spoke of the time when one stone should n[ot] be left standing in order upon another; criticized priests as priest[s] have rarely been criticized; and used definitely prophetic languag[e] when He said: "I will have mercy and not sacrifice". Even th[e] synagogue figures but slightly in the records of His life and ministry[,] but He was trained there and naturally worshipped there. And i[t] was everywhere from the synagogue and not from the Temple tha[t] Christianity extended itself. But the synagogue and the Temple were not rivals in Judaism and caused no conflicting loyalties among th[e] people. Ordinarily the Jew attended the synagogue and rejoiced i[n] its simplicity, but when the great festivals arrived he gladly turne[d] his face toward Jerusalem and offered his sacrifice in the Temple.

All through *New Testament* times, and, as far as we can tel[l] through the sub-apostolic period, Christian worship retained th[e] synagogue characteristics. It was simple, spontaneous, intimat[e] extemporaneous. But by the third century priestly elemen[ts] manifested themselves, and from that time to the Protestant Reforma[-] tion worship was predominantly of the Temple type. Then th[e] synagogue type re-asserted itself and remains with us still.

From this rapid sketch it appears that the forms which ar[e] traditional in Congregational churches are not late innovations an[d] are not to be regarded as inferior to the forms popularly calle[d] "Catholic". If we were forced to speak of superiority or inferiority we should be obliged to emphasize our Lord's indebtedness to the synagogue and His criticism of the Temple. But we prefer to admit that while human differences are as great as they are, there is a place for both types and they are meant to complement one another. They may even complement one another in the same churches and services and should do so if we are to attain to a truly catholic worship.

Confusion has arisen in the discussion of the whole subject by the loose way in which the word "ritual" has been used. Public worship without ritual would seem to be impossible. It may be ritual reduced to the simplest forms, as with the Friends, but ritual it is. We Congregationalists have a definite ritual, and some of our staunchest adherents are most strongly opposed to any departure from it. Bishop

Gore make a legitimate point when he says that "a religious rite is not less material or less necessary because it is simply performed".

How then are we to judge between good and bad ritual? Here we may be allowed to quote Thomas Carlyle who, after saying that it is meritorious to insist on forms, proceeds:

> But there are suitable true forms, and then there are untrue unsuitable. As the briefest definition, one might say, Forms which *grow* round a substance, if we rightly understand that, will correspond to the real nature and purport of it, will be true, good; forms which are consciously *put* round a substance, bad.

In other words, anything that is congruous and helps us to worship God is good; anything that is incongruous and distracts attention is bad. But judgment on what grows round and what is put round, what is congruous and what incongruous, will still depend upon temperament and the tradition in which we have been trained. Genuflexions at altars are distracting to many of us: to others they are symbolic. Some preaching that we may approve would doubtless leave others protesting that it is conventional, if not even irreverent.

One thing, however, we have a right to say—that when spiritual life languishes forms multiply, and when spiritually men are most alert they become independent of and even impatient with much ceremony. That is found not in the Christian religion only but in religious life generally. The great faiths began with the profound simplicities of great men: they degenerated as smaller men turned from the heart of the matter to its trappings. But while in one tradition the interest may be in the trappings of the altar—vessels, vestments, attitudes—the interest in another tradition may be the equally trivial trappings of the pulpit—rhetoric, voice, literary style. Most of us are big enough for the petty things of religion, but few are big enough for those large matters which were always the concern of Jesus Christ.

Instead, therefore, of discussing further the merits or demerits of the two traditions, it will be wiser to enumerate those things which are necessary to any Christian worship.

First, *reverence*. Reverence is not fear which enslaves nor an abject emotion which engenders timidity nor a vague submission to mere greatness. Much that has been said in recent years about the idea of the Holy is more suggestive of primitive superstition than of Christian reverence, which is humility before the Holy Father. It is more than a sense of awe; it is respect for Christian values. Reverence that hinders naturalness and friendliness is less than Christian reverence. There is nothing offensive in expressions of fellowship, and a handshake may be sacramental.

There is, however, a demeanour which while suitable elsewhere is unsuitable in the sanctuary. We may repeat here what has already been said about ritual—that anything that assists the worship of God

is good. Anything that distracts is bad. Carelessness in speech attitude is intolerable. Indifference to detail is not a mark spirituality but a defect in reverence.

A second requisite in Christian worship is *freedom*. Men mu not be so bound either by ecclesiastical order or by denominatio tradition that no place is left for spontaneity. One cannot read t Gospels without the suspicion that Jesus would have commend neither our rigid orders of worship nor our too studied speech. is not surprising that many Anglicans have declared that they w no longer be restricted to and bound by the Book of Common Praye Nor is it surprising that many Free Churchmen demand liberty t use the approved liturgies and devotional literature of all centurie Extemporaneous and liturgical prayer may and should be use alongside one another. To exclude one or the other is to impoveris public worship.

There would be more hope for evangelical religion if Fr Churchmen were more willing to break from some of the conventions. We raise the question here whether when numbers sin below a certain mark it would not be wise to dispense with the usu order of service and learn the value of group discussion and praye A handful of people in a large building is hardly inspiring to eith preacher or congregation, and there is nothing more in accordan with *New Testament* teaching than the informal meeting of the grou There comes a time when pulpit, organ, and pews may be a hindran to the freedom of the Spirit, and we need constantly to remi ourselves that there is nothing sacrosanct about the form.

A third requisite is *fellowship*. Public worship is comm worship. The fellowship will express itself differently in differe environments. We refer here to our traditional type of worship. W recognize this fellowship in praise. We stand and sing togeth knowing that congregational singing is more important than musi excellence. But why not united prayer in General Thanksgiving a General Confession? Not always using the same thanksgivings a confessions but different ones to save us from monotony and va repetition. That may mean a prayer-book, but why is a prayer-boo more objectionable than a hymn-book? And not only joining i thanksgiving and confession, but in responses, said or sung. Eve the "Amen" which should be the ejaculation of the congregation now frequently left to the minister.

In these observations we have been thinking of worship as a offering made by man to God. But worship is also a waiting upo God that we may be filled with His Spirit, and for this the quie expectant attitude is necessary. In group worship (as in th Communion of the Lord's Supper) periods of silence in the servi are valuable. When the larger congregation is gathered in a publ

sanctuary we recommend periods of silence before and after the service. It has been remarked by one with long experience in the Free Churches that "the character of the whole service is determined by the demeanour of the worshipper in the first five minutes". Those Christians are wise who are in their places a few minutes before worship begins preparing themselves for what they are to give and to receive. Prayer before the service makes a great difference to prayer in the service.

Listening is not easy, especially to some temperaments, but it is necessary if we are to receive all that God has to give. We suggest that attention would be held more generally if the Scriptures were read occasionally or even frequently from new translations, especially when the portion is either very familiar or very difficult. Into the large subject of the sermon we do not propose to enter here, but if it is to retain its place, its authority—and the authority of the preacher —must be re-stated. That authority does not rest upon any particular theory of the inspiration of the Scriptures. It rests upon the possession and the communication of a common faith. As Dr. Forsyth insisted, it is not excellency of speech nor cogency of argument. It is different in kind from the essay or the lecture. It is a deed rather than an utterance. "It is a sacramental act, done together with the community in the name and power of Christ's redeeming act and our common faith".

The thing ever to be kept in mind by the preacher or the priest—and by the congregation—is that it is reality, not technical skill in worship, that matters.

F. H. Ballard.

ADVENTURE IN WORSHIP.

Our Sunday services as we have them to-day are a mixture, a compound of two elements, and perhaps the best way to approach the subject would be by an analysis which separates out the two. Our Sunday service is at one and the same time a religious meeting and an act of public worship. If one wished to see each of these two elements in isolation and as free as possible from any foreign admixture, one could go for the religious meeting to a P.S.A. or Brotherhood, while the act of public worship could be seen at its best and simplest where a few people gather in the early morning for a Communion Service in the side-chapel of some great cathedral. The distinction between the two is obvious. In the one case, we have the effort to provide people with those religious activities which they can appreciate and which are helpful to them, while in the other men and women receive in humble gratitude the infinite goodness of God. The same two threads are interwoven in every service, Anglican or Free,

though no doubt there would be considerable divergence of opin
once we began to try to disentangle them.

My concern at the moment is not to pass any judgment on
comparative worth of these two elements, but simply to point out t
they do exist side by side, and that their purposes are very differ
In what follows, I shall deal simply with public worship, except
a few words at the close.

What do we mean by "adventure in worship"? Here, at a
rate, we do not mean the construction of new forms of service wh
would be more acceptable to our congregations than the present o
That would be the business of the religious meeting, not of pub
worship as such. What is required of us is that we should go c
beyond all forms and aids that we at present possess and seek
realize afresh what worship is and how we can best prepare ourselv
to stand in the presence of God. For that is the real meaning
public worship, that we men in all our smallness and sin come in
the presence of God who is great and holy and merciful—and lea
the rest to Him. It is the meeting of the believing community w
God and what happens then, its speech with Him and His with
though of course we must be ready to admit that much may come
pass between the worshipper and the One who is worshipped wh
is far too deep for speech.

With that qualification, therefore, we may think of worship
our speech with God. Our attitude in His presence will have th
marks—Adoration, Thanksgiving, Dedication. It is true that ev
act of worship should contain something of all three, but norma
now one will be uppermost and now again another. Can we
therefore conceive of three types of worship, one primarily
adoration, the second of thanksgiving, and the third of dedicati
Someone may ask whether there is any place in such a scheme
petition. I answer that there is a place for petition, but definitel
subordinate one. We shall ask God for the satisfaction of our nee
but we shall ask sometimes as those who are humbled before
majesty, at another time as children who rejoice in the bounty
their Father, and then again as servants who seek equipment for th
tasks. The same holds good of confession. We shall not ordinari
wish to spend a whole service with our own weakness and sin, f
that would but serve to increase their hold over us. But out of t
thought of God's greatness and goodness, or perhaps out of t
consciousness of our own unfitness for the service to which we wou
fain give ourselves, we shall come to God with the cry, "Fathe
forgive!"

I have sometimes thought of a service which should be whol
given up to adoration. The minister would be in some inconspicuo
position where he could lead the worship of the congregation witho

in any way obtruding himself upon its notice. The voluntary ceases, and there is a moment's pause, broken by the voice of the leader, crying, "The Lord is in His holy temple, let all the earth keep silence before Him". A chord on the organ brings the silence to an end, and the congregation rises to sing unannounced, "We Praise Thee, O God, we acknowledge Thee to be the Lord". Still standing, the leader says, "I will extol Thee, my God, O King", and the people respond, "And I will bless Thy name for ever and ever", and so through the first four verses and the thirteenth verse of *Ps.* 145. Then all kneel to join in an Act of Remembrance of the Works of God. It is for the organist now to provide the transition to the second part of the service, which opens with the singing of the Magnificat and is designed as an act of solemn worship before the Manger and the Cross.

All this is the worship of the believing community standing before God, and with everything removed that would suggest a human intermediary. There would be a symbolism in the fact that the pulpit was unoccupied, for it would remind the people that each man waited to be taught himself of God. Other types of service could be constructed, ruled in each case by the mood of adoration. For example, one such service could set before us for meditation the life of our Lord, while another could turn on the three-fold evangel of the *New Testament*—Christ with us, Christ for us, Christ in us.

Similarly, there might be services which would give expression to the thanksgiving of the Christian fellowship, or to its desire for a more adequate service of its Lord. Such services would bring before God and sanctify to Him the whole round of human life in the family, in industry, and in the State. Use could be made in them of prayers in which all could join audibly. There would be a place, for example, for the General Thanksgiving. Can one conceive a better ending for a service of dedication than the repetition of Ignatius Loyola's prayer, "Teach us, good Lord, to serve Thee as Thou deservest"? I have thought of another form of dedication service in which each member of the congregation rises from his place at the close, goes to the Communion Table, stands before it in silence a moment, and so out of the church.

How far all this is practicable I cannot say. There may be congregations so favourably situated that something of the kind can be attempted in them. I am sure that the use of such forms would mean a permanent enrichment of the spiritual life of our congregations. They would bring a much-needed variety into public worship, yet continuity can be preserved. What I have in mind is that twelve such orders of service, three of each type, could be printed to make up a little booklet. They would be numbered from one to twelve, and a number above the hymn-board would indicate which

was to be used at any particular service, so that the congregat would be prepared and able to follow. I do not mean that the tw services should be taken in rotation, but rather that, Sunday Sunday, that particular one should be chosen which is m appropriate.

To this point we have dealt only with that part of public wors which consists of the speech of men to God. How can we bring that other aspect, the speech of God to His people? Can we u the Bible for this purpose? We can, if we exercise care. The readi of a passage because it is set for the day or because there is a verse it from which one wishes to speak afterwards, may be a perfec justifiable procedure, but it is not the bringing of the Word of God men. For that purpose, we must be content with brief selections fr the Scripture text, often single sentences merely. The aim will to choose those passages in which the fire of the Spirit still glow which convince us when they are read as in some way offering us a word from God Himself. Can we use the sermon? I do n think we can. In so far as the sermon is what a man says about G it has no place in public worship, and can it ever be more than th It may be more than that by the grace of God, but the grace of G does not necessarily accommodate itself to our programmes time-tables. One cannot draw up an order of service and leave minutes in it for a revelation of God, which is not to exceed that li and is moreover to come through a specified individual! The t of public worship which I have been outlining is one which cla the fulfilment of the promise, "They shall teach no more every m his neighbour and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lo for they shall all know Me, from the least of them unto the grea of them, saith the Lord." There will be no place in such worship the minister except as a member of the believing community. will prepare the service in advance and prepare himself, but when time comes to draw near to God he will withdraw into the backgrou lest he should in any way hinder his fellows from making each own individual encounter with God. His place, as we shall see, i the religious meeting.

There is only one way in which we can bring into these servi the speech of God with men. "The word about which the world tur is—silence!" We shall use silence now and again in the course these services, but there will be room also for an act of worship wh will reach it culminating point in the expectant, silent waiting of community on its Lord. The congregation has prayed, h worshipped or given thanks, has realized afresh what the work is which it is called, and it enters now into the inmost sanctuary of Go presence. There is silence, and in the silence the cry goes "Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth". So the congregation wa

on God, in the sure conviction that He will speak. Barth makes merry with this suggestion, which emanates from Otto. "What", he says, "the Church of the Word bring in a Sacrament of Silence!" Ah! with all his speaking about it and about, perhaps Barth has never fully understood how great God's Word is. It is so great that only God can ever speak it, and it comes direct to the soul that seeks it, without waiting for Bible or minister to mediate it with their human words. The highest wisdom for us still lies there, "Where there is that which cannot be spoken, one must keep silence".

I said at the beginning that two things are intermingled in our services to-day, the religious meeting and the act of worship. Must it always be so? Cannot we separate the two, so that each may do its own true work and one may hinder the other no longer? We could do it, if we were to dare greatly and to divide our services into two. The first period would last half an hour and be wholly given up to public worship in some such way as I have described. There could be an interval afterwards of five minutes, during which newcomers could enter and those who wished to leave would be free to do so. There would always be those to whom the time of fellowship in worship had brought something so wonderful that they would fear to go with it into the different atmosphere of the religious meeting, while there would be others who were not yet trained for worship of the highest order Sunday by Sunday. The second period would be what I have called a religious meeting, and could last for three quarters of an hour. It would have much the same character as our present Free Church service, though it would admit of the utmost elasticity. Sometimes, for example, it might open with a hymn and short prayer and leave the whole of the rest of the time for an address. Sometimes the devotional section would be longer and the sermon would be correspondingly shortened. To this service the minister would come prepared to give of his best, out of his study, his personal experience, and his contacts with his fellows. And perhaps while he speaks, the miracle will be wrought, the Spirit blowing where it lists will breathe on him, and through his lips the Word of God will come to men!

E. L. Allen.

THE REFORM OF DIVINE WORSHIP.

One of the most significant features of modern Protestantism is the tendency towards the reform of divine worship. It is by no means confined to this country; there is a definite liturgical movement throughout the whole of the Protestant world. In Germany the movement has taken firm root and is receiving that thorough treatment and investigation which is typical of the best German

scholarship. Neither is it without its theological background. T
fresh emphasis which German theologians are giving to t
transcendent aspect of God's revelation and the rejection of the m
subjective elements has naturally affected the whole idea of worsh
and tended to lift it to a level and dignity commensurate with th
exalted conception of the Divine. From the subjectivity of religio
experience which found its most impassioned prophet
Schleiermacher and most eager disciple in Auguste Sabatier religio
inquiry has swung to the other extreme. The exponents of th
movement are familiar to us in the names of Emil Brunner and Ka
Barth, and perhaps all unwittingly Rudolf Otto finds himself als
among the prophets, for although he approaches the matter from th
standpoint of primitive religious impulses he finds the true religiou
basis to reside in the non-rational character of the "numinous
concept. Arrayed against the background of comparative religion
the sense of the *mysterium tremendum et fascinans* assum
impressive proportions. Nor has Dr. Otto been slow to give th
concept practical value—and this he has done in the region
liturgical reform. In his *Christliche Welt* he has published a seri
of remarkable proposals concerned with responses, the litany, a
the "sacred silence".

Not only in German Lutheranism but within the Reform
Church of Germany there is a strong interest displayed in liturgi
forms; likewise in Holland and both German and Western Switzerla
Nonconformity in America reveals the same tendency and
concerning itself with "liturgical experimentation". From this
would appear that the interest which English Nonconformity is taki
in the reform of its worship is only part of a general movement
the whole of the Protestant world to remould the expression of
worship through the media of liturgy and improved ritual. Heil
in his little book, *The Spirit of Worship*, says:

> There is arising, even in Protestant circles which for centuries h
> been opposed to liturgies, a strong feeling of the need for liturg
> forms. The liturgical movement to-day is a general Christ
> movement which cuts across all Confessional divisions. Christian
> is weary of individualism, which weakens and divides; it is striving
> escape the narrow bondage of the subjective into the freedom of th
> objective, the universal; from the limitations of the isolated individu
> to the fullness and strength of the great Community.

In this country the movement owes its origin and present growt
less to a change in the theological outlook than to a consciousness
the ineffectiveness of both Christian life and worship. Along wi
a sense of impotence in religious experience is to be found
consciousness of the dearth of the Spirit in public worship; and
is a true instinct which detects a common weakness in both, for a
they not but dual manifestations of the Spirit of God in human life

Some have gone further and ascribed the ineffectiveness of our witness and worship to the reduced and attenuated figure of Christ to which much of our present-day *New Testament* criticism has brought us. Driven to its logical conclusion such criticism can do little better than leave us with what one penetrating thinker has called "a french-lacquered Christ" and with a worship hardly to be distinguished from a P.S.A. While this is no argument for the abandonment of either the methods or approved results of modern scholarship it is a challenge to us to look afresh to our sources. Is not the call for the reform of our Nonconformist worship but an instinctive recoil from a merely humanistic interpretation of religious experience and a reaching out towards an object of worship which shall awaken the deepest emotions of reverence and adoration? And may not worship itself do more than anything to redress the balance? Much of the success of the Anglo-Catholic movement in England is due to the fact that it offers ample scope for the exercise of adoration, and within the beauty and dignity of its ritual the soul can find true breathing space. Our deepest need to-day is for a religious vision of God which shall constrain us to bow the head and to know within ourselves the sense of rapture before the Ineffable. Many will urge that sacramental liturgies are to be found in the joy of doing good, but I would affirm that without the exaltation of the Spirit the good cannot be conceived, much less performed. The holiest living is the fruit of reverence, not of resolve, and only from that Spirit do all just works proceed. In the rapture that springs from vision do our actions alone carry that spontaneity, that effortless artistry, that "finish from within"; only from it shall we attain in our actions what we reverence in our inmost hearts.

Our primary need, then, would seem to be a conception of God in Christ Jesus which shall call forth a sense of rapture that shall manifest itself both in life and worship. For worship cannot be self-generated or stimulated by personal effort. All such endeavours must in the long run fix the attention on ourselves as the worshippers and not on the object of our worship. Only as the worshipper forgets himself in what he worships is his action genuine. Not as we constrain ourselves to worship, but as the object of our worship constrains us, comes true adoration. The task of all corporate worship, therefore, must not be to create a state of worship in the minds of the congregation but to direct their spiritual gaze towards an object vast enough for veneration. For Protestants this must ever be the spectacle of God's self-revelation in Christ Jesus centring in His Cross and Passion, through which the hidden secret of the universe is laid bare and in which we as sons of God are called to share. Where other sections of Christendom make the consecrated elements the object of veneration, or trust to the appeal of an imposing

ritual and ornate ceremony to carry the worshippers beyo themselves, for the Protestant the object must be neither material external in any way, but religious—that is to say, in a religious vis of God Who is no less in the earth for being above it, and in Kingdom of righteousness, truth, and love. Thus every pub service should seek to portray the divine drama not through t potency of consecrated food and drink but through the spoken wo which discloses the working of God's purposes on the stage of hum history and experience. If worship is not to lose that sense of reali it must possess not only a personal but a cosmic significance. In far as Christ revealed the secret and heart of this universe Christia would do well to realize that worship does the same in that it disclos the identity of moral and cosmic reality. Not only is Christ the k to the universe but the universe is also the key to Christ. If this is n so then the key to this ambiguous world still remains to be foun Only as the congregation realizes that worship is no me approximation to the truth but unveils the heart of truth will it fe itself to be in touch with reality.

To sum up, worship cannot be artificially generated but is t instinctive response of man's spirit to perfect beauty, infin goodness, and absolute truth in whatever form they may pres themselves to the aspiring eye. Before such things he cannot b bow in humble acknowledgment that he has seen something of t infinite and eternal which alone can satisfy his deepest cravings. T direct the minds of the worshippers towards such a vision must the consistent aim of all organized worship. It is still the convict of Protestantism that no better means can be found for doing t than through the spoken word. The results of appeals made throu the colour and ceremony that belong to an ornate ritual may be m immediate and effective but they carry with them too great a dang of beginning and ending in ecstasy. The only foundation of mo stability and ethical insight must be in a vision which is neit sensuous nor material but spiritual; and that the spoken word c alone convey. Protestants have been right then in making t sermon the apex of religious worship. But that insistence on t centrality of the sermon has carried with it certain perils which ca for exposure and redress. A sermon may be no better than the mo primitive and meaningless rite if its purpose is to produce a emotional response. The test of a sermon is not the fervour expende in its delivery but the religious vision embodied in its thought, an the emotional appeal of that vision alone should make all other ai unnecessary. If the sermon is the apex, however, it should not b the climax. This should consist, as Otto himself suggests, in supreme act of silence when the entire congregation, uplifted by t vision they have perceived, dedicate themselves to God in the stillne

that is within them and around. But such a Sacrament of Silence will only be truly Christian as the vision it envelops is of a God Who is not remote and, so to speak, in the void, but Who is a heavenly Father Who by no means can be avoided. Has it not been in moments like these that old men have dreamed dreams and young men seen visions and to the seeking spirit revelations have been vouchsafed? The test of all such moments of insight is whether they leave us more solitary or more social, more reconciled to God in the strain and stress of life or more at enmity with all He appoints.

Already the new wine of an awakened Christian consciousness is stirring in the midst of this generation. For such new wine we must provide new wineskins, lest, contenting ourselves with the old, we find them burst asunder and discarded, and much good wine spilled.

B. M. Peake.

FREE CHURCH WORSHIP.

Discussions about Public Worship are endless. In all the Churches there is a widespread feeling that something is wrong and a laudable desire for reform. Those who have a concern in the matter are generally agreed on one or two fundamental points, *viz.*, that worship must be real, and free, and Christian. When it comes to practical suggestions, however, it is curious how reluctant our would-be reformers are to carry out their own principles to any logical conclusion. Let it be granted that in all the Churches—Anglican as well as Free—public worship as at present conducted is often very remote from reality, very stereotyped and formal, and in its general tone far more pagan or Jewish than Christian. The trouble is that most of the remedies suggested are quite futile because they deal with the form rather than the essence of the matter. No external readjustments, whether in the way of music, liturgies, responses, or read prayers, will make worship possible or helpful where the true spirit of worship is absent. To speak quite bluntly, what is necessary is more and better religion. For true worship is worship of the Father in spirit and in truth, and the Father seeketh such to worship Him.

In all worship the conception formed of God is vital. The God we Christians worship is no absentee Potentate, King, or Judge. There is no need to beg and beseech Him to hear us or to plead with Him to be merciful and to put away His wrath. He is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our Father, waiting to be gracious, and more ready to hear us than we are to pray to Him. It is right that we should approach Him with reverence and godly fear, but He will certainly not stand on ceremony or hear us for our much speaking or be pleased by the correctness of our postures or by the elegance of our language. The read prayers that are now so common, with their

balanced periods and carefully turned sentences, are obviously p
pared with the congregation in view rather than God, and are a mi
able travesty of the real thing. Extempore prayer may be, and so
times is, an offence to man and an abomination to the Lord, bu
need not be so if the ideal of worship is the right one. Indeed, i
the only way of securing that simplicity, directness, spontaneity, a
sincerity which should characterize every approach of the Christian
his Father, God, whether on his own behalf or on that of others. T
Protestant objection to ritual and liturgies is far more than a reacti
against an abuse. It is the vindication of the individual's right
access to God and of the fundamental simplicity and reality of t
relation between the Father and His children. Liturgical worship
its best has about as much relation to real life as have the etiquette a
atmosphere of a Court. Our Free Churches know a better way a
they will abandon it at their peril.

But how is this high ideal of public worship to be maintaine
There is a defeatist notion abroad that it is too high for flesh a
blood and that the lower road is the easier and safer. But this w
never do. The public worship of God is a high and holy thing n
to be attained without consecrated effort on the part of all those w
engage in it. When the people are all together with one accord in
one place waiting upon God, they cannot fail to be aware of
presence and to hear His voice. For the minister the Sunday wors
is the culmination of a whole week of meditation and prayer.
comes to it from his knees having prepared not his words but h
self. When he sees the people before him and visualizes their nee
his heart is surely stirred within him, and he will pour out his wh
soul in prayer with them and on their behalf. In such worship ado
tion, thanksgiving, confession, and petition will play their p
There will be room, too, for silence, for that

> Still communion which transcends
> The imperfect offices of prayer and praise.

In such worship, too, the sermon will come as but the climax of
spiritual process in which all present have had their share, and
minister will feel that the people help him as he seeks to help the
If public worship is to bring men and women face to face with t
living God and to send them away humbled and uplifted with renew
faith and courage it will be in proportion as it carries them away fr
beaten tracks and set forms into that ampler air where the spirit, li
the wind, bloweth where it listeth.

All this, no doubt, is very difficult in a restless and materiall
minded age. But it has never been otherwise. We are told that the
is a widespread thirst for religion which the Churches do not satisf
But it was under such conditions and in order to meet this very ne
that our Free Churches sprang into being. Spiritual freedom is the

birthright and heritage and the very breath of their nostrils. They won it at a great cost and their witness to it is still needed. Their mission is to set forth Christianity in terms as vital and imperative as those of its first preachers. Their day is not done, as some would have us think. In a sense it is only beginning. For on the Free Churches especially now rest the duty and responsibility of proclaiming the gospel of the grace of God and vindicating the liberty wherewith Christ doth set His people free. This mission they can never discharge by becoming pale imitations of other Churches, but only by being themselves and living up to their ideals. Let them be true to their principles, have the courage of their convictions, pay the price of their freedom, and they will have their reward.

W. B. Selbie.

REFLECTIONS FROM PEIPING, JULY, 1933.

This year, according to the classical Chinese calendar, the weath is regulated by one lonely celestial dragon; this, being interprete means that the rainfall should be unusually heavy. Those years which a greater number of dragons are in control are comparative dry; the intensity of the drought being proportional to the number dragons present. The story goes, and this reflects a true image Chinese thought, that too many dragons spoil the climate; instead minding their allotted business they continually fight among then selves.

Curiously enough, this year has actually followed the prediction of the old calendar, at least in the Peiping region. Wang Lung, th Dragon King, has given us more than four times the normal rainfa during June, and shews only slight signs of relenting during th usually rainiest month of July.

The Japanese evacuated the Luan River regions only just in tim to avoid being marooned on flooded flat land over which transport troops would have been impossible. With twelve-and-a-quart inches of rain in one month on nearly flat and undrained plains o does not expect much in the way of military manœuvres. One cann yet say of the truce how permanent it is or how dependent upon loc climatic conditions.

The invasion of North China territory inside the Great Wall seer to have been the result of an astute betrayal by the Nanking Gover ment of the many privately owned and independently operated armi in the north. The losses to China consequent upon the invasion ha been little more than the elimination or disabling of a number of su medieval war lords as "Wang the Tiger" in Mrs. Pearl Buck's *So* The campaign of the Nanking Government against Japan has so fa been little more than an agreement to refrain from supporti northern armies while Japan did the "cleaning-up" desired by bo sides. Even in the historical Shanghai incident the Nanking Gover ment did not spend a single cent to resist the invaders; by "master inactivity" they pushed the brunt of the attack on the Ninth Rout Army privately owned by Canton war lords. True, Canton is pa of the territory of Nanking's China, but allegiance is loose enough t make any weakening militarily of Canton a desideratum of Nanking.

From this point of view it is undoubtedly true that the Chin against which Japan has been fighting is not an organized natio The organized nation has not yet been doing any fighting, but ha been saving its resources while the Japanese have merely bee suppressing private and troublesome factions. Japan has not yet ha a chance to come up against the real military strength of the Centra Government.

The Generalissimo, President Chiang Kai Shek, was, together with many of his associates, trained in Japanese military schools; he has the military knowledge of the Japanese coupled with an inheritance of political astuteness and strategy unknown in any other country of the world. As an example of this we can see that out of Japanese aggression General Chiang makes international capital in the form of League assistance (save the word!), and at some trifling expense and loss of territory—which never was under his control anyway—achieves national unity and a complete military ascendancy over the Empire. What civil warfare remains has been handed over to the Japanese militarists who apparently want something to do. One can almost see Chiang Kai Shek chuckle up his spacious sleeve as his Finance Minister, T. V. Soong, presents without a single foreign loan the only balanced budget of any major government.

This article would degenerate into a set of reminiscences if all the local colour were to be included. How our mechanic has had to host no less than ten soldiers in his two roomed house and store his possessions in our laboratory for safety, how our serving boy's brother had to park his wife and baby boy in our kitchen quarters for two weeks, how bombing planes have visited us almost daily until stormy weather prevented—all this helps us to realize how close to the front we have been. But the particular phase of local colour which seems most interesting here is the reaction of Chinese students to the developing situation.

When the Japanese first threatened, by their creation of disturbances in Shanhaikwan, to invade the territory inside the Great Wall, the students became exceedingly patriotic. Yenching was about the quietest university in the Peiping-Tientsin group at the time, and even from here students organized themselves into patriotic groups for definite purposes such as the study of first aid, chemical warfare, radio code and operating, boycotting propaganda, military drill, and the like. A few groups went to the front in a futile attempt to join in the fighting. This was very near to the time for semester examinations, and against these the student body went on strike, claiming that they could not prepare for them and carry on their patriotic activity thoroughly. The university was temporarily closed and not until complete accord between students and staff was attained—actually through many individual discussions and formally through the organization of a number of emergency committees composed of both staff and students—did work start again at the end of the spring vacation.

Since that time the Japanese have actually been inside the Great Wall and almost within gun shot of Yenching. It is interesting to note that the closer they approached the less belligerent became the attitude of the students. When the Japanese were actually next door the Final Examinations were taken without a murmur or a protest by

all those who had dared to remain on the campus. Some of the wealthier students had left for home down south, where parents had been worrying about their safety.

We are not interested in the Pacifism that runs away. What, however, have those students learned who have remained with us in spite of danger? And what have we ourselves learned by seeing our life's work threatened with destruction at the hands of a modern military machine?

The Peiping student, once an ardent volunteer, is again a pacifist. His faith in the military method has suffered disillusionment. If the Japanese come and take control of Peiping, that will be distinctly unfortunate; but our student will make his home elsewhere if he is financially able to do so, whereas if his funds are too low he will have to stay with the rest of us and see what happens. In any case there will surely be no danger from fighting; he knows the Chinese military will not be fighting a losing battle.

He has come again to realize that these wars are not wars between peoples, being nothing more significant than squabbles between militarists whose aims and purposes are entirely divorced from anything remotely connected with the peoples' good. Accidents of government mean nothing but more or less trouble. The Real China pursues its way no matter what "authority" collects the taxes, and the youth of North China is in danger of losing faith even in a National Government.

In case I have been generalizing too much in the above evaluation of student thought, I will state just what reasons I have for believing it to be at least an approximation to the facts. While no circular questionnaires have been issued and no such "scientific" evidence is available, one has more subtle and perhaps more reliable ways of getting at the inner feelings and thoughts of one's student friends. Daily discussions with a group of post-graduate students carrying out quite an extensive programme of research in Physical Science gives one plenty of opportunity for intelligent observation. Actually living and working with such a group gives one a better understanding of their minds than any questionnaire issued by some passing traveller interested in understanding things of this sort. Probably, however, the group is representative only of science students in general, and these comprise a little more than half of the student body at Yenching. The students in the College of Public Affairs are probably of a different type; particularly we may note that a far higher percentage of Public Affairs students than of Science students fled from the campus at the more critical period. In Physics, for example, only one student failed to make his appearance at the Finals, out of a total of thirty specializing in Physics.

We may easily feel that the Chinese youth is making a grave error in slipping back into the old cynical attitude towards governments and politics; and for that reason we may hesitate to approve of the pacifism he begins to acquire.

While most of us have persuaded ourselves that in England we have self-government, in some of our more detached moments—and they are frequent at this distance—we have a feeling that democracy is a delusion. We are ruled in England by the press and munitions and brewery interests; or, rather, these are the parts of our democracy that have the final "say" in government at present. In China we are ruled by the tax-collecting militarists, and the only part of China's community that has any important say in government outside the military is the banking circle. In general we may say: The more powerful a popular organization becomes the more "say" it will have with government, even though its chief interest has nothing to do with political matters.

Since the groups most efficiently organized and most influential with governments in the West are almost entirely anti-social interests, we cannot believe that we have government by the people for the people. The only sure way of eliminating such anti-social interests is by developing the real interests of humanity and so organizing them that they become strong enough to insist upon good government and international peace. Patriotism linked with national governments as at present constituted is incongruous; such governments are at best struggling beginnings, fighting at the wrong place against anti-social interests.

Industry and the pursuit of knowledge are the activities of the human race which we may count as significant in the improvement of humanity, in developing the art of living. The art of organization is only one among many expressions of art, and organization for the collection of taxes by landowners and bootlegging militarists is surely about the least significant of any. "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's" uttered as an afterthought to something far more important, does not seem to have reminded us that more positive things require our attention than the struggle to keep the tax-collector in his place.

The modern scientific culture, organizing the whole world for industry, is the only sure way of bringing to an end those anti-social interests responsible for national jealousies. No cultured person will narrow his interests to the national boundaries within which his birth happens to be registered. Participation in national warfare is also impossible to him once he realizes that positive activity in the spread of the modern world culture is the only way finally to secure peace.

WILLIAM BAND.

THE FUNDAMENTAL HERESY.

THE world in which we live is no longer a literal world nor the univer a literal universe. A brick is not a brick, nor a star a star. "Thing are not what they seem". Whirling electrons have taken the plac of solid substance in the tiniest bit of matter and in cosmic magn tudes. What science discovers at the end of its search is not *the thin itself*. To quote Eddington:

> The environment of space and time, of matter, of light and colou and concrete things which seem so vividly real to us is probed deepl by every device of physical science and at bottom we reach symbols— none the less it is a real world if there is a background to these symbols.

Symbols are all that science can reach, all that its methods are adapted to reach. If we want meaning, value, interpretation, we mus go to philosophy, art, poetry, religion.

The fundamental heresy of life is to mistake symbol for the thing symbolized. In philosophy this means materialism, in psychology behaviourism, in art crude realism, and in religion the literalism tha kills.

Dr. H. E. Fosdick has said, "Wherever the mightiest word is t be spoken it is a symbol that speaks it". This is true, but it is als true that we can nowhere escape from symbols. Language itself is system of symbols. Every word spoken or written is a symbol o something that eludes all effort at direct expression. Gesture, ritua ceremony, creeds, even the most abstract, are all efforts to shado forth a reality that no symbol can more than suggest. The presence o myth, allegory, and parable in the great literatures of the world bear eloquent testimony to the symbol as essential to the self-expression o the human spirit.

There is to-day a growing literature of revolt against the worshi of the symbol as a substitute for reality whether it be in science, i religion, or in practical life. The essential idolatry of to-day and o every day is not that of the ignorant pagan who bows down to his idol Oftentimes in this act may be discovered a spirit of deepest devotion, the outreaching of the dumb human toward the dim divine mediated by the crude idol before which the worshipper prostrates himself. No, the essential idolatry, whether in an individual life, in a social system, in philosophy, or in religion consists in the denial of *meaning* in the universe and in the life of man. It consists in a horizontal, rectilinear interpretation of the scheme of things in general and of one's own life in particular. "Trying to understand life as something physical and chemical", says Count Keyserling, "amounts to the same thing as trying to gather the meaning of a sentence from the letters of the alphabet as such". The relation of symbol to reality is that of

grammar to poetry, of the printed note to the musical tone, of the colours of an artist to the ideals which he portrays on the canvas. It is the difference between a dead catalogue of events and a prophetic rhapsody, between the Biblical *Chronicles* and *Isaiah*.

To get away from the symbol is impossible. Some symbols appeal to the eye, some to the ear, and some to the mind as concepts. The swastika, coming down to us from immemorial antiquity, is a symbol appealing to the eye. We see it everywhere as a decorative form. Until its resurrection in modern Germany, it had become merely a "fossil" form, but it was once instinct with life and auspicious meaning. So "om", the "most venerated syllable in the world", is a symbol appealing to the ear. For milleniums it has been surcharged with religious meanings to millions of the human race. Abstract ideas and concepts expressed in intellectual formulas and creeds are a later evolution of the sophisticated mind, but are still only symbols suggesting realities that for ever elude definition.

We literally live, move, and have our being in a world of symbols, and the meaning of life emerges only as we see within and behind these symbols significances for which they stand—significances that ascend the *scala sancta* of life to the very heart of reality. We walk in a show, not a vain show but in a world of symbols, a metaphorical world and one from which we can no more escape than we can from ourselves. Science works within a realm of symbols, but beyond symbols it cannot go and still remain science. When it reaches the end of its analysis, as in the new physics, it comes to the jumping-off place. Here poetry, art, philosophy, and religion take their stand, and from the symbol as a springboard "leap" to the realm of meaning, value, and all the high interpretations of life.

Symbol and significance form a dual fact from which there is no escape. What the mysterious link is between life's facts and life's values we do not know. Here we come to an unsolved riddle. When we can say what is the relation between body and mind, between physical vibrations of the air and the psychic experience of a musical symphony, then, perhaps, we may be able to say. Our wisdom is to find in every symbol, be it of nature or of human nature, a form that shall body forth an inner and spiritual meaning to enfranchise, beautify, and transfigure life. As the highly wrought glass lens is the means by which the astronomer sees the stars, the symbol is the means by which the soul sees into the wonders of the unseen world of the spirit. As particles of dust are centres around which the vapour of the upper air gathers to be precipitated in rain, symbols are the nuclei around which gather the meanings that refresh and enhance life.

To state this fact in terms of religious philosophy is to say that divine immanence is a universal fact, and that all things partake in their own measure of the eternal. In the words of Wordsworth, there

is a "motion and a spirit that rolls through all things". It is this fa
of immanence that constitutes everything a symbol. Like the hier
glyphics of Egypt, these symbols may await centuries and milleniu
to be deciphered, but the spirit of man will never rest until it has fou
the clue that shall lead to the interpretation of life's mystery. Religi
is the supreme interpreter, and poetry, art, and philosophy are its i
spired oracles in picturing forth to eye, to ear, to mind, and to hea
the inner meanings of the mysterious universe of which we are a par

Everything is saturated with value. Tennyson's little flower in th
crannied wall holds the secret of "what God and man is" for a min
that can know it "root and all, and all in all". As a part of nature
partakes of the spirit of the Whole—a Whole which is not the sum o
its parts but a Whole which lives *in* its parts as life in the human body

All things assume a new aspect when the inner eye is opened.
Things are seen as symbols; they become translucent, and irridescen
with meaning. The "old things" have passed away; a new world o
unimagined beauty appears. Fifteen years ago an article appeared i
the *Atlantic Monthly* entitled "Twenty Minutes of Reality", in whic
the author related how as a convalescent reclining on the porch of
hospital one bleak March day the drab world about her, together wi
every person and every living thing, was revealed to her as supe
latively beautiful and unspeakably "important". Her own words w
indicate the nature of this experience:

> Once out of all the grey days of my life I have looked into the hea
> of reality; I have witnessed the truth; I have seen life as it really is
> ravishingly, ecstatically, madly beautiful, and filled to overflowi
> with a wild joy, and a value unspeakable. . . . I saw no new thing, b
> I saw all the usual things in a miraculous new light—in what I belie
> to be their true light.

It would be easy in the literature of mysticism to multiply su
experiences.

What shall we say to this? Does it not mean that nature is t
carrier of values and that what we see and hear are only so many sym
bols of meanings which lurk in all things? The lines of Franc
Thompson suggest this philosophy of mysticism:

> O World invisible, we view thee,
> O World intangible, we touch thee,
> O World unknowable, we know thee,
> Inapprehensible, we clutch thee.

Meaning is a matter of infinite gradation. The mystic, we may
believe, has the deepest insight into the significance of life, bu
wherever the universe presents itself to a human soul in the terms o
truth, goodness, and beauty, there we find the germ of mysticism
which is the recognition of value—an awareness of meaning in th
symbols that surround us. It is all a matter of degree. Jacob's ladde
rests at its top in the blinding light of the battlements of heaven; it

oot rests on the earth, but the angels of God ascend and descend, nissing no rung from top to bottom. Wherever there is meaning, here is God, and if there is meaning anywhere there is meaning everywhere.

Is it not the denial of these insights into the realm of meaning that constitutes the real and essential heresy of life? To disbelieve a creed, o doubt a fact of history, to disregard a ritual or custom made sacroanct merely by virtue of repetition—these do not constitute heresy. Heresy is to shut one's eyes to the primal meanings of life which are xiomatic and self-evidencing to the unblurred vision of the human pirit. In every grade and under every guise it is the failure to sense piritual meanings and values in the symbols that surround us as the ir we breathe.

The shores of time are strewn with the shells of dead symbols that ere once luminous with meaning. Language is itself a museum of fossil poetry". Metaphor is the mother tongue of the human spirit. he literal-minded man is one who takes everything at its face value, o whom a tree is only a tree, a flower is only a flower, a star is only star, a human form is only a human form, an event in the day's work r in history is only an event. He is the matter-of-fact man to whom Vordsworth's words "a sense sublime of something far more deeply nterfused" are sheer nonsense, and to whom Tennyson's "Higher antheism" is a waste of words signifying nothing. Someone has said at the literal-minded man is like the fisherman who is for ever mendg his nets while he neglects the fishing. The profundities of life are nknown to him. Life is a show wherein puppets play their little part ntil the curtain drops and the lights go out. Life and the world, ith all it contains, are not symbols but dead facts with no further gnificance. Even the greatest personality of history is a "dead fact randed upon the shores of the oblivious years".

There is a poet in us all who died young. Children are open-eyed the wonder of the world. Lewis Carroll knew what he was doing nen he wrote for his three young friends *Alice in Wonderland*. Vonderland is the native land of the child, and it is the nemesis of e sophisticated that the primal wonder of the world is so often hid om their eyes. Even Wordsworth with his infinite sensitivity and sponse to nature laments his inability to see what once he saw:

> There was a time when meadow, grove and stream,
> The earth, and every common sight
> To me did seem
> Apparelled in celestial light,
> The glory and the freshness of a dream.
>
> It is not now as it hath been of yore;—
> Turn wheresoe'r I may,
> By night or day
> The things which I have seen I now can see no more.

To keep the child mind, and if lost to regain it, is to see the w within the world. Perhaps a twentieth century philosopher would that it is to see the realm of values in the world of facts. Religi "conversion" will open this world of wonder. Saul Kane in J Masefield's *Everlasting Mercy* on the morning after his spiri transformation exclaims:

> Out of the mist into the light,
> O blessèd gift of inner sight
> . . . . . .
> All earthly things that blessèd morning
> Were everlasting joy and warning.

An experience of intense suffering will jar open the door on its hinge the commonest experience will at times introduce one into a n world of mystic experience. Jacob Boehme saw the sun's rays flected from a pewter plate, and in that moment his inner and ou world was transfigured beyond the power of words to express.

Do we live in a world of meaning? This is the most momento question the human mind can ask, and the answer has relevance only to one's own soul; its repercussions in the realm of practical are infinite. To stem the growing tide of secularism, materiali indifferentism, cynicism, and pessimism that threaten to undern the social order, nothing can avail save an interpretation of life's fa in terms of spiritual values and forces. Religious hatreds, racial a pathies, political feuds, and economic rivalries are in the last anal rooted in our failure to see the universal in the particular, basic hu values in life's multiple symbols, and the glory of a divine mean in every common thing. A true diagnosis of the "bread line" a exists to-day would reveal the fact that our economic mind is a *lit.* mind. We have no adequate sense of bread as a symbol of unive fellowship in the economic goods of life. "The furious tempo of acquisitive civilization" possesses us, and the essential indictmen modern capitalism is its refusal to see a social meaning in the tools material goods of life. As a system for creating wealth it has be towering success. As a method of serving equitably the econo needs of the people it is a tragic failure. Human life is organic, atomic, and unless the present system can be made to serve the terests of life and life abundant for all it must inevitably face the har writing on the wall. Sir Launfal kept the Holy Supper when he s in his crust of bread the symbol of human fellowship. We may ho that a contemporary writer is a true prophet when he says: "In the we shall have a world-wide economic fellowship and this will beco the eucharist of a world religion".

Religion is still the revealer of life's mysteries. It is the interpre of life's high symbolism. The meanings that make life intelligi and significant emerge only under its guidance. The alternative t

faces modern civilization has been impressively expressed by Dwight Bradley in his book, *The Recovery of Religion*:

> Unless religion be recovered within the next generation it is likely that either the civilization that now holds dominion over mankind (so-called western civilization) will collapse, or that the human race will make a lopsided progress along mechanistic lines, and that within one or two centuries at most mankind will have become unaware of the existence of God and will have developed into a species of mechanical automata, physically beautiful, socially well-ordered, intellectually keen, but spiritually as blank and as vacant as a marble statue.

To deny a divine meaning in life, a meaning that underlies all acts, that hides waiting to be apprehended at the heart of all sin and stupidity, and brings cosmos out of chaos—this is the essential heresy from which all other heresies issue as streams from their fountain head.

W. W. Willard.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developme in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practi experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some probl in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas an record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from ti to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be gl to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

CHURCH UNION—HOPES AND CAUTIONS.

It was my privilege recently to listen to an interesting discussion f current proposals for a union between ourselves and our friend belonging to the Presbyterian Church of England. While the r semblances between us and these fellow-Christians are striking, t differences too are not inconsiderable; and it may be argued that the differences are far-reaching, and hence, that we should do best by c tinuing to maintain our separate forms of witness to the comm faith. On the other hand, it is plain that this particular proposal union is only one indication of a strong current setting in that dir tion. Without stopping to restate our own distinctive principles methods, it may prove helpful if we can elucidate the principles wh ought to regulate unions between groups of churches. Where uni is legitimate and is practicable, disunion can hardly be anything e than sin.

The largest organization of Christians must be left on one si So far ahead as we can see, the unreformed Church of Rome w admit no other terms of union than abject admission by Christi outside it of claims which neither honest scholarship nor a relig of intelligent spirituality can endure. This strange fact must allowed its full significance.

Nearer to us in place, and also considerably nearer to us in spir is the Church of England; it insists upon the episcopate (without Papacy) as the great bond of visible unity. According to the Hig Church and Anglo-Catholic party, bishops represent the apostle other champions of the Episcopal communion put its claims upo lower grounds, but insist with no less vigour that the "historic episcopate, having endured so long, must continue to characteri the Church of Christ until the end of the world.

With the first of these doctrines we can hold no parley; and i existence goes far to vitiate the second, in our judgment. If so supe

stitious and unhistorical a view were confined to a dwindling minority, we might close our eyes to it on the principle of *De Minimis*. But, seeing that it is the war cry of an aggressive and "insolent faction", submission to Canterbury is almost as inconceivable to us as submission to Rome. Unity at all costs! External unity! The Pope will trump the best cards of the Anglo-Catholics, and take every trick.

In reality, the College of Twelve Apostles was conceived by the Master—or so Gospel tradition teaches—as destined to "sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel". Thus it was ethnographically limited, being part of Christ's appeal to those who were, according to the flesh, His own people. And it was eschatologically conceived. In the nature of things, apostles could have no successors. It was the Church of later days, feeling about for a system of rule, after it had become plain that the Kingdom of God was not "immediately to appear"—it was the Church that adopted personal government[1]. That was the imperial system—the system of the whole civilized world as it then existed. The Emperor was "supreme", and "governors were sent *by him*" to perform certain subsidiary but indispensable moral tasks. Personal rule in the State is discredited by the ideals of democracy. Why should it be insisted on in the Church? Why pour new wine into such extremely old bottles?

A rather startling *questionnaire*, sent out by the authority of last autumn's Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, suggests that we—on our part—are moving further than we have ever yet done towards organization from headquarters. Whether wise or unwise, this action was certainly not taken without weighty arguments in its favour. Apart from any thought of union with other Christian Churches of a more centralized type, it was feared that our present system—or lack of considered system— involves waste of our scanty resources and of the overtaxed energies of our men. If our second thoughts confirm this fear, and if we act upon it, changes made within our own denomination—under a sense of personal duty—may bring us appreciably nearer to a Presbyterian polity, if not even to Methodist connexionalism. And thus the obstacles in the way of wider unions may be lessened. What one misses in the *questionnaire* is frank recognition that small and struggling causes have *not* a moral claim to the full-time service of a Christian minister—one chapel, one pastorate! To suppose that each little company of believers has a divine right to absolute independence, and that the salary of its pastor must not be suffered to be appreciably less than that of the minister of the City Temple in London or of Emmanuel Church at Cambridge—this is a fantastic programme, which never will be feasible, and which (though it were feasible a hundred times over) *ought* not to be put into execution. Presbyterian influence will give us no help, at this point;

1 And gradually put together the myth of apostolical succession.

rather the reverse. Methodist influence might help us. The magn
cent if sometimes exasperating denominational loyalty of the child
of John Wesley contrasts strongly with the traditional *ethos* of Co
gregationalists. Our Methodist friends are the most denominatio
of all Christian denominations; we, the least. But they know how
use lay ministries; and we must learn that lesson.

One may urge that it is no part of Congregational principles
ignore the judgment of neighbouring churches. Rather should ever
thing be done to secure their sympathy, and to commend the loc
policy to their brotherly approval. On the other hand, it is a sour
Christian principle that as much as possible should be done by pe
suasion and by convincing the other's conscience—as little as possib
by the naked exercise of authority. Even in the State, where forc
is always—so to speak—just round the corner, this must be true; muc
more so in the Church of God.

The desirableness of acting in brotherly harmony with neighbou
ing churches of our order has found its modern expression in the in
stitution of the Moderatorship—a thing more and more expedient a
communications are more and more improved until distance threate
to disappear from the earth. Provided there is no nonsense abo
apostolical succession—and that danger is happily excluded by o
method of appointment—provided further there is no smallest mim
cry of the unreal Anglican vow of canonical obedience to a bisho
the Moderatorship may be regarded as sound in principle and usef
in practice. The moderator is the authorized adviser of all church
Others—leading ministers or suitable laymen—may have done simil
service in the past and may continue to do it still. But the Moderat
is a picked man, whose business it is to know all the facts, and
give confidential advice—not commands. Is not such an addition
our polity an obvious piece of Christian wisdom?

If we for our part have been discovering the value of a modera
degree of centralization, other communions are discovering what w
fully realize—the folly of too rigid insistence upon doctrines. In co
trast with earlier Independency, modern Congregationalism has n
thing that can be termed a standard of doctrine; upon one side, indee
it shades off into Unitarianism. Nevertheless, our characteristi
witness is evangelical, not Unitarian; but we believe that such carna
weapons as prosecutions for heresy have not helped the Christia
cause in the past, and must prove still more disastrous to-day
Obviously, our modern attitude has its dangers. Yet is it not true t
say that what we do, frankly and straightforwardly, almost all com
munions of Christians are doing in point of fact, but unadmittedly?

This changed attitude towards doctrine may bring other bodie
of Christians, in their turn, nearer us.

Even in the Church of Rome, dogma is hardly what it was in th

past; at least, I cannot conceive that any "practising Catholic" would now be subjected to Inquisition regarding his private opinions, so long as he kept reasonably quiet. Now-a-days, dogmatic orthodoxy s becoming a technical prerogative of the priesthood—if indeed it s not further true that, so long as priests are content to employ the anguage of tradition, they are probably safe enough in *thinking* more reasonably. Still, all this is below the surface. The Church of Rome deliberately stands for dogma, as found not only (they suppose) in he Bible, but in Church Councils, and in ordinary church administration—if also, of course, eminently, in the formal pronouncements of his Holiness the Pope.

The Church of England is drifting more and more steadily Romewards. Who could dare to speak of it to-day as "the bulwark of the Reformation"? A sorry bulwark, indeed! Yet the Broad Churchmen of the past and the Modernists of the present represent something very different from the prevailing drift; and it has proved impossible o dislodge them. There is as much liberty—licence, perhaps—in certain quarters of Anglicanism as among our own extremists.

Presbyterianism in Scotland, as found in the large re-united Church, is willing to supplement its inherited creed with more modern statements of faith, but is afraid to dislodge or even to modify the Westminster Confession itself. Thus, formally and technically, though surely most unreally, the main body of Scottish Christians still puts forward the scholastic Calvinism of the seventeenth century s its central vision of truth. If anything is to come of the hopes or union in England between Congregationalists and Presbyterians, he Presbyterian Church of England must exhibit a greater degree f courage than its brethren in Scotland have done. On the other and, I personally might be willing to see a new statement of faith rawn up, and even to tolerate the express acceptance of such a statement by our ministers—an acceptance in general terms, not a vow f detailed loyalty to its several theses. Doubtless, even this might rove too great a concession for many Congregationalists. Meantime, is for the smaller and more credal body to make proposals. *Tirez les remiers, Messieurs*![1]

1 My dear friend Principal Micklem in his contribution to *Essays Congregational d Catholic* proposes to employ the word "dogma" for religious (in contrast with cientific) knowledge. I cannot think that "dogma" is at all the right word for this ade of meaning. Dogma claims extreme scientific precision—26 inches to the mile d more. Dr. Micklem further explains that religio-dogmatic knowledge is symbolical it is also a knowledge of *God in action*). I should much prefer to speak of an *element* symbolism. Pure unqualified symbols, recognized as such, are likely to be shorted—as one felt with bewilderment, long ago, in studying Browning's *A Death in the sert.*

Almost more surprising is Dr. Micklem's approval of the Vatican Council's affirmaon of "mysteries" in the full and proper sense—*i.e.*, as unintelligible propositions which to be authoritatively enforced. *They* worship they "know not what: we know what worship". We know in part alone, confessedly; but *we know.*

Most staggering of all is our Principal's readiness to swallow the creeds *en bloc* composed of dogmas in his sense of the word; but they abound in their own sense!

Another group of questions arises regarding the settlement of ministers. The Congregationalist tradition is one of unqualified local independency, modified to some extent in the case of aided churches. Presbyterian theory might perhaps legitimate the overriding of the local choice by superior "Church Courts"[1]. In practice, Scottish Presbyterian congregations had a hard battle to fight not with tyrannical Church Courts, but with lay patrons—patronage being the occasion, while not, in the full sense, the cause, of nearly all the splits and separations in northern Presbyterianism. In the course of controversy over extreme abuses of lay patronage, the "rights of the Christian people" came to be more and more asserted[2]. To-day Presbyterianism is everywhere interested in these "rights". It was an extremely clever stroke by which Disraeli's Lord Advocate in the 1874 Government got Lay Patronage abolished in the Established Church of Scotland.

Methodist connexionalism behaves differently. It gives those of the local community a chance to issue their own invitation; but, if they fail to make a choice, or to secure their man, Conference steps in. After all, a three years' ministry is endurable even when it is not all that might be desired, and Methodist loyalty is generally prepared to make the best of things. Also there are traces in Methodism of the features of that revivalism out of which it shaped itself into a Church. Naturally, the evangelist delivers his message, and then passes on to repeat the same message elsewhere. Three years—still more, six—are a long enough period for such a ministry. The work of "pastors and teachers", on the other hand, can naturally adapt itself to long periods of time.

By persuasion, though not by coercion, the enlarged "denomination" of future days ought to be able to find room for procedure approaching that of the Methodists, if only when negotiations for an agreed settlement miscarry.

A different range of survey is dealt with by the Rev. Hugh Martin, of the Student Movement, in his pamphlet on the *Unity of the Free Churches*, reproducing in print, by authority of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, an address delivered to that body. Mr. Martin's title omits—how inevitably!—a conceivable union in the remote future with Anglicans; not to speak of Romanists. He is appreciative of what has already been done in the way of federation among the Free Churches, but urges that something more is needed if we are to be saved from shameful waste and overlapping. He hopes

[1] I was told long ago, as of a rare and remarkable event, how—some generations since—a minister in charge was twice "called" elsewhere and twice desired to accept but was twice over forbidden by his Presbytery to leave them.

[2] Rather to the disgust of that eminent Tory evangelical, Thomas Chalmers. "I have a moral loathing of they Whugs", he had said—as if they were wretched expedient men, without discoverable moral principles anywhere about them. In the form of rights or claims, even principles made no appeal to Chalmers.

that our spirit of comradeship will gradually develop until fuller union becomes possible and inevitable; perhaps he underrates the difficulty of constituting a United Free Church of England when there is already a "Church of England" congregation in every parish—they may too often ignore us; we hardly can ignore them.

When he comes down to immediately practical proposals, Mr. Martin leaves Methodism on one side for the present, as being preoccupied meanwhile with its own domestic tasks of harmonizing and consolidation. But—himself a Baptist, and a convinced one—he urges that Baptists as well as Congregationalists and Presbyterians ought to get into committee and work up towards union. It is possible that an attempt to bring in the Baptists might throw negotiations back —perhaps on the side of the Presybterians; more probably still, because of the deep separations between Baptists and Baptists of which the late A. J. Viner used to warn us. Nevertheless, I submit that the majority of Congregationalists would feel much happier if they saw their Baptist brethren approached in a spirit of full Christian brotherhood. Let the project be well tried out! Do not let a veto proceed from *us*, before the possibilities have been "explored" at all!

If episcopacy is a business-like one-man rule, in substitution for more primitive charismatic gifts, the problem of baptism—*who* are to be baptized?—belongs equally to the second Christian century and not to the first. As administered by its great instituter, John, baptism was eschatological—it looked forward to the Day of Judgment. Nor, in the earlier Christian usage, was there any thought of adapting baptism to successive generations. When that problem had to be faced, no clear light shone forth from heaven; perplexity remained. It does so still; the Baptist answer has a case, and a pretty strong case, in its favour. We think our own answer wiser—yet we are not blind to its dangers. The one possible hope for the future lies in a mutual respect which will tolerate differences without breaking fellowship. As I—and doubtless other wiser persons—have already pointed out, the true and abiding significance of baptism is seen on the mission-field. There, something of the primitive note is struck, and the glowing sense of God's presence and grace in the ordinance is renewed.

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

THE GUIDANCE OF GOD.

THE problem of divine guidance has again come prominently before us recently, especially owing to the emphasis given to it by those associated with the Group Movement. While we recognize the value of the movement in various directions, its ideas regarding divine guidance have made some feel that we need a far clearer understanding

of this matter if we are not to be led astray. Every Christian belie in divine guidance, because he has experienced it; but it is one th to believe in it, and quite another to accept a special theory as to manner in which it is given. There is an urgent need to endeavou interpret our experience of guidance so that we may have as cl an understanding of how that guidance is given, and the methods ought to adopt to make it more truly ours.

There are those who look for guidance from God as they wou look for guidance from a friend as they hold conversation with hi This seems to be the expectation of those who have their "qu times", during which they wait for and expect direct messages fr God in regard to the duties they are to fulfil, or the problems th desire solved. Apparently, all they have to do is to be quiet and si cere enough, and their thoughts will be divinely directed, their wor divinely inspired, their deeds divinely prompted. This is a ve simple way of securing guidance; and, doubtless, God could gui us in this way if He chose to do so. The question, however, whether this is the way God does actually use. Many have sincere believed that they have again and again received His guidance in t way, and any doubt about it will seem to be irreverent and a den of their experience. Yet there are very great difficulties in the w of accepting this method of guidance as specially divine.

That many wonderful things happen in these "quiet times" we not doubt at all. The whole point is whether these experiences are be regarded as God's special interpositions for the direct guida of men's lives. We cannot deny that there are many mysteri psychical influences continually playing upon our minds. So people seem to be more open to their reception than others; yet is probably true that we have all had some experience of them some time or another: times perhaps when we have taken a cert direction contrary to our original intention, and have met some whom we wanted very much to meet, or who very much wanted meet us, or when, through no reason apparent to us, we recei strength or special wisdom to meet a particular situation. Some these experiences may be due to what we are pleased to call telepath where one mind is in touch with another without any physic medium; some may be due to uprushes from the deeps of the su liminal consciousness, where memories are stored and racial e perience preserved; some may be due (although of this we are not all convinced) to contacts with the spirit world. It does seem th periods of quiet are valuable for the reception of these impressions often these mysterious psychical influences are experienced in slee when the outer world has been cut off altogether from consciousnes We know that R. L. Stevenson owed a great deal to the thoughts th came to him in his dreams. Coleridge was indebted to a dream f

his *Kubla Khan*. Many have solved in their dream-life problems that baffled them in their waking hours. Sleep seems to give a larger freedom to mind processes than is possible during waking hours. Are we to regard these mysterious psychical influences that come to us, either in the "quiet time" or in sleep, as divine guidance, or merely as the operation of psychic laws of which at present we have the most meagre knowledge? That these times do provide us with valuable material cannot be denied. This material may enrich our own life or help us to enrich the lives of others; but can we regard it as anything other than material to be used? If such material is given to us we shall thank God for it, as we should thank Him for any other gift; but shall we not rather ask for wisdom to use it wisely?

These experiences seem to come to people irrespective of their desire to know and to do God's will, and this would suggest that we are to regard them as influences only, and not as God's special method of guidance. The mysterious makes a tremendous appeal to us; there is always a danger that we shall seek and covet guidance along the lines of the mysterious, and fail to see that God is seeking to make His will known to us in far more obvious ways around us. We may be referred to the cases of guidance cited in *Acts,* to the case of Ananias being sent to Saul of Tarsus, or the message that Philip received in regard to the Ethiopian eunuch, or to Cornelius being sent to Peter at Joppa. These cases do seem like the direct guidance of God, as if God is in direct communication with men directing them according to their need; but if that is so, it opens up the big question why others in desperate need of that particular kind of guidance have failed to receive it although they earnestly sought it. It may be that the explanation of these strange experiences is that certain minds have the power of communicating their thoughts to one another, and that under the stress of strong desire this power of communicating becomes easier; that where there is one in need and another able to meet that need and anxious to help, such minds are *en rapport*. Mysterious psychical influences brought these people together: the divine guidance really started when they were brought together, and the way of life was unfolded to them by those who had come into touch with Jesus, and whose moral and spiritual vision had been awakened by that contact with Him.

What can be said of these psychic influences is that they do seem to enlarge our privileges and responsibilities by providing greater opportunities of helpful service. It may well be that God intends us to develop these mysterious powers. Whether we all have them, or have them to the same extent, it is impossible to say, but that many more have them than use them is very likely; and in developing them, we put ourselves in the way of greater usefulness. But it is one thing

to say this, and quite another to say that along these lines God's guidance is to be expected and looked for.

There are several reasons for suggesting that it is not in this particular direction that we are to look for and expect the special guidance of God.

1. *It is an impersonal guidance.* It does not depend upon a moral conviction of what is right, but upon impersonal influences operating upon the personality, none the less impersonal although they may emanate from persons. I may be guided by someone and at the same time be blindfolded and know nothing of the path by which I am being led. This is impersonal guidance, in spite of the fact that it originates from a person. It may be a very helpful guidance, yet it is less than personal unless my moral personality is concerned with it, unless, that is, I am assured that it is the path I ought to go. This impersonal guidance suggests that the more passive we are in God's hands, the more clearly He is able to reveal His will to us. It is almost akin to the wax in the hands of the writer, who takes up his "stilo" and writes his message; or it suggests a person at one end of a telephone sending a message to another at the other end, who merely receives and acts upon it. The chief difference seems to be that there may be other writing on the tablet besides God, or others speaking on the telephone, so that it is necessary to use methods to check the authorship of the writing or of the message, and so recourse has to be made to the Bible, to conscience, to reason. The difficulty about this kind of guidance is that it seems to make the experiences of life irrelevant, and to make earnest thought unnecessary. It suggests that it is not from the experiences of life that we are to learn how we may best guide our lives, nor by reflection on life, on its mistakes and its successes. Does God deal with us as sons, enabling us to enter intelligently into His thoughts and discover His will, or does He desire to guide us without any intelligent understanding on our part? If the latter, then the chaos of to-day would seem to reveal God's signal failure to achieve His purpose.

2. *It is a guidance that is sub-Christian.* It makes the life and teaching of Jesus, if not irrelevant, at least inadequate for the guidance of our life. The guidance does not depend upon any vision of right and truth. It is not supremely from Jesus that we are to receive guidance for life; it is not through the moral vision imparted by fellowship with His life and death that we shall discover the duties that we are called upon to fulfil, or the solution to the problems that perplex us in other directions. Is not guidance in the Christian sense dependent upon that sincere dealing with Jesus as we meet Him in the Gospels, and upon loyalty in our daily life to what we have seen? Is it not thus that we shall have duty made plain, and our problems solved?

3. *It is a sub-rational guidance.* It is not when the mind is most active and is struggling with all earnestness and sincerity to discover the will of God that guidance is given; but when the mind is passive and open to influences from the sub-conscious. We are guided most when intellectual activity is suspended and we give ourselves up to mysterious psychical influences. Does God guide us by means of the rational or the sub-rational? Are we not supremely guided by the moral vision that we have attained by an interpretation of our experiences in life as we have dealt with them in sincerity and truth in the light that Jesus sheds upon them? Are we not also guided as we have fellowship with others past and present, who by their reflection upon life, and their loyalty to what they have seen to be true, have discovered something of its meaning? Yet that guidance is never worthy while it is slavish imitation, or merely the acceptance of the ideas and judgments of others; but only as the truth which they shed upon life is seen by ourselves, because it shines in its own light. No guidance is in any sense Christian that is merely the reception by the mind of influences from outside us for the control of our life, unless we can discern that that is the path we ought to take. God does not ask us to go blindfold through life, and be led infallibly by Him; but He so deals with us that we can discern the way we ought to take; and He will not save us from blundering, if by our mistakes we can gain a clearer vision and greater certainty of the way we ought to go, and therefore greater confidence in walking in it.

4. *This guidance is not always verifiable.* We are told that we must check the guidance given in the "quiet times" by reference to the Bible, to conscience, and to reason, that we may be sure of its divine origin; but much of the guidance given by its very nature cannot be so verified. We may receive an urge to visit someone, or to go somewhere, or to do something or say something. We cannot necessarily verify whether these urges are divine or otherwise: there is no check upon them. The strength with which these urges come is not an evidence of their divine origin.

5. *This guidance is not infallible.* If it were divine, it would always be infallible; but it is far otherwise. Two people faced by the same difficulty, concerning which they require guidance, might seek it in the quiet hour; but will anyone say that, provided they are both sincere, the same guidance will be given? If this were God's way of guiding us, would there not be a speedy end to many of the common difficulties from which we are suffering? When we were faced by exactly the same problem, and we sought guidance, should we not, as we remained in quietness before God, know what the will of God was? Yet those who practise the "quiet time" differ on many matters; indeed, there are differences, not inconsiderable, in doctrine and religious practice, which they refuse to discuss; but if infallible

guidance is given in these times, why is it that such differences r
main? Why is it that, when we most desperately need guidance,
"quiet time" does not necessarily bring any guidance at all? D
it not really show that this sub-rational method is not God's way
guiding us? Surely all the appalling differences among men, w
as far as we can judge, are equally sincere, are an emphatic refutat
of the assertion that the method of God's guidance is by the subm
sion of our minds to these mysterious psychical influences.

We would not minimize the value of the "quiet time" or t
material which such a time provides; but the ability to profit by th
impersonal operations depends upon our understanding of what G
requires of us, and of what we and others need. It ever remains tr
that "light is sown for the righteous" and that "He that followe
after me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life
The only sure guidance comes from loyalty to the truth we see, an
not from obedience to mysterious urges, whose origin is dubious, an
which have no moral content.

ALEX. SMALL.

TRUTH AND AUTHORITY.

I HAVE been reading, with mixed feelings, *From Faith to Faith,* and
so happened that just after finishing it I came across this sentence
Prof. Gwatkin's: "The return to mere authority is as plain a si
of unsettled belief as any blatancy of unbelief". I hope it is not d
courteous to say that it seemed to me that Dr. Orchard's wh
apologia is a commentary on that text.

Let us clear the ground by mentioning some things which may
taken for granted. For instance, Dr. Orchard's lovable personali
and his undoubted sincerity. Practically all the reviews of his bo
pay tribute to the latter; and the former equally needs no evidence
all who have made his acquaintance in the flesh or even in his writing
Both characteristics shine forth in this volume, and I would fain ho
that all that follows in this article might be read in the light of the
words.

Again, Dr. Orchard's wide knowledge is beyond question. He
is no tyro in philosophy or theology, but one who has given lon
years to reading and thinking. Moreover, he is able to marshal h
thoughts in clear and consecutive fashion—though there are sign
in this present book that already the inevitable influence of the author
tarian system which he has embraced is making a differenc
One detects, here and there, an incipient mistiness and subtlety, no
to say the beginnings of a manipulative dexterity, in the attempt t
reconcile facts to theories, which, if it may be said without offence, i
a frequent puzzle to the plain mind in reading Roman Catholic works

But there is no possibility of mistake or uncertainty as to Dr. Orchard's main drift. "This book", he says, "has been written with the open purpose of persuading all Evangelicals that the Catholic issue must be faced if Evangelicalism is to endure". This is stated again and again. Far more than an *apologia pro vita sua* (Dr. Orchard is much too modest to write a book about himself), this volume is an appeal to his old associates to consider what he now believes to be the implications of their position. The Evangelical experience, Dr. Orchard is convinced, has no guarantee of permanence, has nothing ultimate about it, except in so far as it leads on to the "full Catholicism" from which, in his view, it derives, and in which, in his case, it has ended.

Not that Dr. Orchard has any vestige of contempt for the Evangelical experience in itself. Indeed, he does not even criticize it, in the sense of throwing doubts on its reality and essential truth. An admirable feature of his book is its freedom from that patronage of old friends and old scenes and old beliefs which is sometimes an objectionable element in the writings of "converts". As a matter of fact, it is plain that Dr. Orchard's sensitive soul squirmed at the condemnation of his former position implicit in the declarations he had to make on joining the Roman Church, and whether some of his remarks in this connexion will satisfy the more thoroughgoing ultramontanes among his new associates remains to be seen. However this may be, it is clear that Dr. Orchard does not look back on his Protestant years as lit by a delusion, but as (let us say) a more or less dim dawn gradually brightening into the full day of Catholicism. He makes it evident that he still believes in the essential truth and validity of the evangelical experience of pardon and new life in Jesus Christ. Only, he holds that in itself it has no guarantee of continuance. Unless it leads on to the complete Roman Catholic system of belief and practice as we know it to-day—involving, of course, such things as the infallibility of the Pope, Mariolatry, indulgences and transubstantiation—it must sooner or later come to nothing: probably by losing itself in the sands of rationalism or scepticism.

This, then, is Dr. Orchard's main contention; and it is at this point that we who are still wholeheartedly and enthusiastically Protestant and Evangelical, and propose so to remain, take up his challenge. Without concerning ourselves with such details in the Romano-Protestant controversy as those mentioned at the close of the last paragraph—important as they are, and certainly capable of being effectively dealt with from the Protestant standpoint—let us take up Dr. Orchard's main point, a consideration of which will reveal the central weakness of his whole position.

Dr. Orchard's argument amounts to this: that there is no guarantee of truth continuing in the earth unless it is protected by the

authority of an infallible society. That is the implication of his repeated contention that the Evangelical experience—the truth of which as we have seen, he admits—has in itself no certainty of continuance except as it leads on to "Catholicism". The answer to this might take several forms. For instance, the words of Dr. L. P. Jacks are in themselves conclusive:

> If an infallible authority is needed to guarantee a Divine Revelation does not any institution which claims to be that authority need another infallible guarantee to authenticate the claim, and so on *ad infinitum*

Again, taking the phrase "an infallible society" at its face value where is such a society to be found? The *fons et origo* of authority is admittedly the mind or spirit of Christ, and the manifestation of that mind to-day is not limited to any one section of the Christian family, as Dr. Orchard would himself agree. From which it would seem to follow that all men and women who have this spirit must constitute the true Church, and the only "infallible society" that can reasonably be conceived. The argument, whatever else may be thought of it, at any rate disposes of the exclusiveness of the Roman claim.

But the all-sufficient answer to Dr. Orchard's position is that to insist on the necessity for any external guarantee or support for truth —whether infallible book or infallible society—is essentially distrustful of truth. It is much as if a builder should insist on external buttresses for a house he is putting up. The reflection on the foundations would be obvious. We should know what to think of that house, or at any rate what the builder thought of it.

As against Dr. Orchard we assert that if, as he admits, the evangelical experience is true, a real experience of God in Christ, that itself guarantees its continuance. In other words, we hold that truth is its own authority, and neither needs nor can have any other than that which is inherent to itself. To speak of any outside authority giving it validity, a validity which otherwise it would not possess, is obviously to make it subservient to that which certifies it. And what happens when truth is dethroned from the position of supremacy, and anything else usurps the place which it alone rightly occupies, is writ large in some of the sorriest entries on the pages of ecclesiastical history.

One wonders what the position of scientific truth would have been by this time if it had had to run the gauntlet of an authoritarian scientific papacy throughout the ages! Would progress be a possibility at all if every new idea and discovery had to receive an official imprimatur before it could be promulgated or utilized? And if it is replied that there is no real parallel between religious truth and scientific truth, we demur. Truth is one, and the method of ascertaining it always the same, whether we are dealing with this "department

of it or that. Free enquiry, personal experiment, the trying out of hypotheses without let or hindrance or embargo or restraint, based on the conviction that that which is true will reveal itself as such by persisting, and that the false will fail to stand the test of time—this is the method. And this is the only platform on which the true believer—the true believer in the only adequate sense of the term, *i.e.*, he who believes in the supremacy and invincibility of truth—can take his stand.

Prof. Gwatkin is right: "The return to mere authority is as plain a sign of unsettled belief as any blatancy of unbelief". Any man who takes that road must, whether he is aware of it or not, lack confidence in the inherent capacity of truth to defend itself.

Dr. Orchard will continue to occupy a warm place in our hearts. The end, as far as he is concerned, is not yet. If he reverses his recent step, he will not be the first who has returned from Rome, disillusioned and disappointed. But, whatever the future may have in store for him, we would affectionately assure him that we cannot share his apprehension as to the evangelical experience. The truth of this experience is the guarantee of its continuance, and it needs no other. And we would further suggest to him that any claim on the part of the Roman Catholic or any other Church to "corner" truth, either in its present manifestation or in its future prospects, is as absurd, in view of the incontestable facts of life, as would be the attempt of some ultra-Hitler or super-Mussolini to control the winds of heaven that had the audacity to blow on countries other than his own.

A. Garfield Curnow.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

CRICKET SKETCHES.

I. A Day at Leyton.

It is very difficult for a Yorkshireman living in London to remain hum during the summer months, though, of course, there are jaundiced so who believe it is impossible for any Yorkshireman to be humble at al even Mr. J. B. Priestley. He goes to Leyton, or Lord's, or the Oval, a if he escape sitting in the seats of the scornful, it is only by the grace God. If it be a Test Match, it is a Yorkshireman who opens the innin Yorkshiremen who bowl the other side out, and Yorkshiremen who set example in the field. If it be an ordinary County match, he sits and liste to the gibes of those who desire, above all, that Yorkshire shall be "tak down a peg", but, as the day goes on and his team's marvellous efficien crushes Middlesex or the M.C.C., Essex or Surrey, he glows within hi as e'en the ranks of Tuscany are constrained to cheer.

This week I thought fate had treated me scurvily indeed. The Varsi Match at Lord's, Yorkshire at Leyton, and I had to keep my nose to t grindstone at the work of a church, or else at a Theological Conference Cambridge : there's a sense of duty for you, O Tom Carlyle—two days a Theological Conference where men were discussing tape-worms a cancer, relativity and revelation, when there was cricket to be seen !

But to-day I had my reward, even though this morning the forecast say "Showers. Bright Intervals". At 9 o'clock it was raining, and I s to myself, "No cricket to-day", and began to look with some distaste a pile of books on the Oxford Movement. At 10 o'clock the sun began shine, and I announced to the family, "Macaulay and Verity will b them twice by tea time", and I was on the ground ten minutes after p began. My prophecy proved true, though on this occasion Verity di almost unaided : 17 wickets for 91 in four hours' cricket.

And while I was fighting tooth and nail against a superiority comp —was it a losing battle, I wonder?—the Essex batsmen were struggl feebly in the grip of a relentless, apparently all-compelling complex of opposite kind. True, the wicket was helping Verity, but when he did b a bad ball, the batsmen generally seemed too paralyzed to hit it. Tr even though Mitchell was in hospital, the Yorkshire in-fielders were markably good—the out-fielders may as well have been in Leeds for they had to do—but the helpless way in which bats were held out pla into their hands in more senses than one; Sellers picked five of his se catches almost from the bat itself. One player only, Peter Smith, had courage to get to the pitch of the ball and drive; he let us see two love cover drives, one in each innings, and it is clear he ought to be promot in the order of going in without delay. The rest all batted as if they kn they were going to be out at any moment, in some cases not even maki a stroke at the balls which bowled them. If there is a stronger dope tha this sense of inferiority, it must be powerful indeed. Yet I suppose the are men who are just as helpless before drugs or drink, lust or gree passion or pride.

And if the players were a study, so were the spectators. Had we not be warned that Essex were doing well, and that Yorkshire would be given hard run for their money? Had we not been told that this year there wou be no record first wicket stand, but a very different story to chronicle? A then wicket fell after wicket for a score of 104 in one innings and 64 in th

next, and Verity set up a record of another kind. The supporters of the home team were nearly as bewildered as their representatives in the field; they were almost too dazed to barrack, however mildly. Only once did they rouse themselves a little—when Wood made a premature appeal for lbw, Nichols having got his bat to the ball just at the last second; they shouted "Is that the way you win your matches, Yorkshire?", and cried "How's that?" the next ball. But the ball after shattered Nichols's stumps, and it was the triumphant Yorkshire minority who cried "How's *that?*". As the crowd made its way through the gates, I heard some of them mumbling about "Inferiority Complex", for the jargon has spread to the proletariat in the shilling seats.

By four o'clock I was paying pastoral calls, thinking that the best antidote to arrogance. For not even a Yorkshireman can retain for long a sense of triumph if he be a minister of a church in North-East London. In that capacity, at any rate, the enemy is the defeatist spirit, which is ever suggesting with insidious guile that all the work is labour in vain and but pouring water into a bucket full of holes.

14th July.

II. Two Days at Lord's.

When once I had committed to print the sketch of "A Day at Leyton", I realized that I had burnt my boats. Yorkshire had still to meet Middlesex at Lord's; what if they should fail after what I had written! Vivid memories flashed before my mind of Hearne and Hendren batting for hours which seemed like years against Yorkshire bowling; Hearne immovable, with machine-like precision, turning balls to leg, Hendren actually daring to lay back and knock the great Wilfred—the greatest of all slow bowlers—through the covers. But soon I cried, "Away with these unworthy doubts: what I have written, I have written; Yorkshire will not let me down".

The next business was to contrive my work so as to be free for the match at Lord's. Printers and Providence tried their best to prevent this arrangement—the one by holding back work until it was certain to come in the week of the match, the other by interposing a funeral. It soon appeared, however, that the funeral would be on the third day of the match; where Yorkshire is concerned, however, there rarely is a third day, so that did not trouble me very much.

The Middlesex team presented a very unfamiliar appearance. One asked where the giants were. Could it be that the Middlesex amateurs had no particular desire to face Yorkshire, and that Hearne was glad that he had not to stand up to Bowes? It was evident at once that the opposition provided was altogether inadequate. Hendren, however, had scored over 300 in the last match, and when he snicked a ball to the wicket-keeper every Yorkshireman in the crowd appealed with such vehemence that Wood incontinently dropped the ball. Middlesex were soon out, and Holmes and Sutcliffe began the Yorkshire innings. For purely personal reasons—"conceptions only proper to myself", as Shakespeare would say—I have great sympathy with a man in the middle forties who suddenly finds himself unable to get runs, and I should have liked to see Holmes get a score like the 315 I saw him make at Lord's a few years ago. But it was not to be. Sutcliffe and Mitchell, a much improved batsman, got themselves out by taking bad balls too easily. It is true of cricket, as of other things, that the man who thinketh he standeth must take heed lest he fall. Barber let us see some delightful strokes, and not out playing to orders.

I did not enjoy this day's cricket as much as I might have done; f time in the morning I had a man sitting next to me who knew nothin all about the game but would talk and exhibit his ignorance; in the a noon I had as neighbour a man who had brought his wife and had to n conversation with her, to discuss the comfort of the seats, Covent Gar holidays, an economy stunt on which they were engaged, paying calls, what not. There they sat, yapping away over after over when there cricket to be seen! Needless to say they were not a Yorkshire pair Yorkshire wife would have known that she was there to watch the cric

Early next morning, I said to one of the Yorkshire players: "Are going to finish them off to-day?" He replied: "Well, I've paid my in town on the strength of it". It really did seem, however, that Yo shire might be baffled and have to stay for a third day's play. Lee bat with great confidence and skill, and through the sultry afternoon the sc mounted to 115 for 2. For a time the Yorkshire bowling was lifeless deed: rarely have I seen it so ineffective. Was it the weather, or was the influence of the way Bowes walks back to the beginning of his run? funeral wasn't in it. Maybe it was because he had not fully recovered fr illness, or maybe (*Eureka*!) because he was trained at Lord's, not Headingley. In any case, if my name were Sellers I should speed up th performance: Bowes's deliberation must waste quite a few minutes in t course of an innings, minutes which one day may be precious and ma all the difference between 5 points and 15. But it is because of the sopor influence on the team that I should insist on a little acceleratio I thought of the way Emmott Robinson went about his business—or way in which Macaulay does still, for that matter: it was almost poss to have a nap every time Bowes began to walk back from the wicket. almost out-Walled Wall.

Rain came on at 3.30 and I left to get some work done. I should have been at all surprised to learn later in the evening that Lee and H dren had batted till the close of play; but neither did it surprise me learn that Verity had speedily brought the innings to an end, and Yorkshiremen after all were able to get their day's rest.

Next year I hope that Middlesex will be able to find a team to give th a good game, if only for the sake of those who have to live w Yorkshiremen in London.

26th-27th July. ALBERT PEEL.

FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS.

The Epistle to the Romans. By KARL BARTH. Translated by Sir Edwyn C. Hoskyns, Bart., M.A. Oxford Press. 21s.

Die kirchliche Dogmatik. I: Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes. von KARL BARTH. Erster Halbband. Kaiser Verlag. München. 1932. R.M. 14.

The Barthian Theology and the Man of to-day. By JOHN MCCONNACHIE, D.D. Hodder. 7s. 6d.

Theologische Existenz Heute! von KARL BARTH. Kaiser Verlag. München.

It is now fifteen years since Karl Barth published the first edition of his Commentary on *Romans*. That first edition was the work of an obscure country pastor, and none was more surprised than he at the interest which his book created. It was, as Barth has said, as if a man climbing up the stairway of a church tower had clutched a rope for guidance, and found that he had pulled the rope which made the great bell of the church to ring. Of that first edition, as Barth puts it, nothing but the preface now remains. The second edition of 1921 was an entirely new book. Less violent and extreme than the first, to some of us who read it soon after its appearance, it seemed violent and extreme enough. The translation before us is of the sixth edition, but, apart from new prefaces, these later editions agree substantially with the second. The country pastor became in 1921 the theological professor, and Barth's chief interest since then has been in systematic theology.

When we read this book in its second edition we little thought that anyone would be bold enough to undertake its translation into English. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns has had not only the courage but the skill to complete this almost impossible task. If English readers find this translation hard to read, they may comfort themselves with the reflection that the English version is lucidity itself compared with the tortured German of the original, and Sir Edwyn has lightened his readers' task by explaining many of the unfamiliar allusions in which the book abounds. In gaining clearness, the translation inevitably loses something of the passionate intensity of the original. No English style—unless it be Carlyle's—could reproduce what Sir Edwyn rightly calls "the violent and explosive character" of the German.

It will be interesting to see what impression this book makes on those who now read it for the first time. The reviewer read the original when as yet Barth had published no other book, and when it was impossible to foresee in what direction the so-called Barthian movement would develop. It seemed to him then for all its perversity one of the most poignant and disturbing books that he had read. It was impossible to regard it as an adequate exposition of Paul's thought. At times it seemed rather to express what Paul may have thought of God just before his conversion than what he thought of Him when through Christ his terror of God had changed into love and trust. And Barth by the scorn he poured on Christian theology and ethics and on the activities of the Church, seemed to reduce the Christian message to silence and to permit to our faith nothing but an awed response to the awful and unintelligible Word of God. Since then Barth and his greatest associate, Brunner, have become professors of theology, and from Brunner have come clear and incisive books both on theology and on ethics, whilst the Barthian movement, which seemed at first to destroy the motive for the Church's social and missionary work, has proved capable of inspiring a deep, if humble and chastened, zeal.

This commentary on *Romans*, as Barth himself says in his preface to his English edition, "seems to have been written by another man to meet

a situation belonging to a past epoch". Yet, much as Barth has chang since he wrote this book, the book has not lost its value. It express with a violence he would not now use, his abhorrence of the "Titanis of much modern thought and of the sentimentality of that Christian tea ing which dares to speak of love to God without first having tremb before His awful majesty.

If the teaching of this book were likely to become dominant in t country, there is much in it that we should feel compelled to criticize. B at present it is more necessary to learn from Barth than to criticize hi and even if we reject much of his teaching it is well for us to have o complacency shattered by his tremendous indictment of a self-centred comfortable Christianity. It is impossible to give any short account this apparently chaotic and yet fundamentally coherent book. It may more useful to quote a few of his sayings.

> Since power belongs only to God, it is the tragic story of every man of G that he has to contend for the right of God by placing himself in the wron
>
> There is no such thing as mature and assured possession of faith: regarded psychologically, faith is always a leap into the darkness of th unknown, a flight into empty air.
>
> In Jesus, God becomes veritably a secret ; He is made known as t Unknown, speaking in eternal silence ; He protects Himself from ev intimate companionship and from all the impertinence of religion.
>
> Love which obscures the distance between God and man and which not grounded upon fear is, in the end, directed towards the No-God of th world and brings men under the Wrath of God.

Lutherans have spoken much of the comfort of religion, but

> religion, so far from being the place where the healthy harmony of life lauded, is instead the place where it appears diseased, discordant a disrupted.
>
> Religion is not a thing to be desired or extolled ; it is a misfort which takes fatal hold on some men and is by them passed on to others.
>
> Conflict and distress, sin and death, the devil and hell, make up reality of religion.
>
> Religion is the misfortune which every human being has to endu though it is, in the majority of cases, a hidden suffering.

By "religion" Barth denotes man's approach to God. God's appro to man is expressed by the words "God sent His own Son". This is

> the word of freedom which religion is unable to discover.

To God

> the human historical Jesus bears witness. But Jesus is the Christ : that is to say, the particularity of God is illuminated by His existentiality.

He sent Him "on account of sin".

> And since the mission of the Son of God is the divine reaction agai sin, it can be described only in weighty negations, preached only in paradoxes, understood only as that *absurdum* which is, as such, *incredible*. T offence which it occasions us is the reflex of the scandal which we are to Go
>
> Were we to discover in Christ a road of faith which skirts round t edge of the final scandal of the Cross—then the relativity, the dissolution the parabolic nature of the flesh would not have been set forth, the assau of sin could not finally have gone home, and neither would sin have bee condemned nor men have been saved—existentially.

Those difficult chapters of *Romans* (9-11) Barth discusses under t three heads, "The Tribulation of the Church", "The Church's Guilt" "The Oneness of God".

> The Church, situated on this side of the abyss which separates ma from God, is the place where the eternity of revelation is transformed int a temporal, concrete, directly visible thing in this world. In the Chur

the lightning from heaven becomes a slow-burning, earth-made oven, loss and discovery harden into a solid enjoyment of possession ; divine rest is changed into human discomfort, and divine disquiet into human repose.

The Church is the endeavour to make the incomprehensible and unavoidable way intelligible to men.

The Gospel dissolves the Church, and the Church dissolves the Gospel.

nd yet we may not

hold ourselves aloof from the Church or break up its solidarity but rather, participating in its responsibility, and sharing the guilt of its inevitable failure, we should accept and cling to it.

This Commentary has to be read as a whole if it would be understood. t is a sombre and disturbing book and yet a book which puts iron into ıe blood.

In 1921 the country pastor became the professor of theology. In 927 Barth published his *Prolegomena to Christian Dogmatics* under the tle *The Doctrine of the Word of God.* To the reviewer it seemed a dis-ppointing book. From the Barthian movement came soon one great theo-ɔgical book, *The Mediator* (*Der Mittler*) by Professor Brunner, but arth himself seemed to wear the professor's gown awkwardly and to ave been more at home in the prophet's mantle. Barth in this book uotes at great length and often with little relevancy from the writings f the Protestant Schoolmen, but showed little sign that he had studied dequately that whole development of Christian theology, knowledge of hich alone can save a theologian from provincialism and eccentricity. arth himself has come to realize the inadequacy of this book. The olume before us, *Die kirchliche Dogmatik,* I, i, though described as a :cond edition, is really a completely new book. This massive volume of ore than five hundred big and closely printed pages deals with only half ıe contents of the first edition. Another volume is promised to complete ıe Prolegomena. Then will follow four other volumes equally elaborate.

Barth has studied and learned much in the five years that separate the :cond from the first edition. His range of interest is now enormously creased. In particular, he refers often to the great theologians of pre-eformation times and especially to Augustine, Anselm, and Thomas quinas. Barth now recognizes the validity of many of the criticisms velled against him. The whole conception of existential thought is ɔandoned. He tells us that he read with horror the criticism that he had iilt his whole theology on the basis of existential thinking and confesses at in his reliance on existential philosophy "he had shown reverence to lse gods". Instead, Christian Dogmatics has for its sufficient basis the 'ord of God. "It can learn and should learn nothing from philosophy".

This half volume contains Barth's discussion of the Word of God and e first section of the division on The Revelation of God. That first ction deals with the Triune God, for Barth still maintains—wrongly as e believe—that the Doctrine of the Trinity is to be treated not as an ulti-ate intellectual implicate of faith in God through Christ and in the Spirit, lt as the first statement of Christian theology.

The gravest criticism some of us made of Barth's first edition was that his reaction against the subjectivity of much modern theology he ught to make Revelation purely objective, whereas it must be ex-rienced, if it is to be known. That criticism is no longer pertinent, for is second edition has sections on "The Word of God and Experience" d on "The Word of God and Faith". He permits us to speak of cer-inty, though that certainty is not self-certainty; it is created in the liever by the Word of God. Faith is experience; it is a man's act of cognition.

> In faith we have an actual experience of the Word of God and "*finitum non capax infiniti*" and no "*peccator non capax verbi divini*" ought to prevent us from taking this proposition in earnest with all consequences.

This is, indeed, an advance on Barth's earlier position. His teaching now becoming less distinctive because more true. Yet man's act is n primary. As Barth puts it (referring to *Rev.* 3^{20}):

> it is, indeed, true that man must open the door but that is, in regard act and power, the work of the Christ who stands outside.

We may well wonder if in these days theological books as long an elaborate as Barth's are necessary. Barth protests that a chur catastrophically misunderstands itself if it think of theology as an occupa tion for theorists or a luxury for quiet days—a sort of luxury possible fo the Church in times of peace but not in times of crisis. For a Church i peril there is no more pressing problem than inner consolidation, and tha means theology.

This first half-volume of Barth's *Dogmatics* was published in Decem ber, 1932. Two months later Dr. McConnachie sent to the press hi second book on Barthianism, *The Barthian Theology and the Man o To-day*. This book contains full references to Barth's second edition. was an extraordinary achievement so soon to assimilate and describ Barth's massive volume. Those unable or unwilling to read Barth's boo will find here a concise summary made by one who faithfully and uncriti ally reproduces Barth's teaching.

The fourth book before us, *Theological Existence To-day !* is pamphlet written by Barth on the eve of the fateful Church election of 25 June of this year. What Barth calls "theological existence" is

> the connexion with the Word of God and the validity of the special calli to the service of God's Word.

From the standpoint of one who seeks thus to serve God's Wor Barth boldly attacks the programme of the "German Christians who seek to make the Church the tool of the Nazi party. Bar sums up his opposition to their programme under nine heads. H denies that it is the concern of the Church to do everything to bring t German people again into the way of the Church. It is the Church's co cern that in it there should exist the command and promise of the free a pure Word of God. The German Protestant (*evangelische*) Church is t Church of the German Protestant people, but it serves the Word of G alone. The Church proclaims the Gospel in all the kingdoms of the wor and so in the third kingdom (of the Nazis) but not in subordination to and not in its spirit. The fellowship of the Church is not determined b blood or race but by the Holy Spirit and by baptism. If the Germa Protestant Church exclude Jewish-Christians, or treats them as Christian of a second class, then it will have ceased to be a Christian Church at all These are bold words for anyone to write in Germany to-day. His ninth thesis appears thus :

> (9) - - - - - - - - - - - -

Evidently Barth concluded this section with words which his publisher did not dare to print.

This brave protest illustrates what history has often shown : those tha have learnt to tremble before God need have no fear of man. It is thos who know the sovereignty of God who can best withstand all huma tyranny.

SYDNEY CAVE.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

" Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for ranted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—RANCIS BACON.

" A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed nd treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London, and the date* 1933 *unless otherwise ated*).

ord Riddell's War Diary, 1914-1918. Nicholson & Watson. 21s.

eace-making, 1919. By HAROLD NICOLSON. Constable. 18s.

ne Challenge of Europe. By SHERWOOD EDDY. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

We are constrained to wonder if there is a movement on foot to habilitate Mr. Lloyd George. Within a few months we have this War iary, Mr. Harold Nicolson's *Peace-making*, and the beginning of the pub- cation of Mr. Lloyd George's own *War Memoirs*. They all tend to the me end, and we ask ourselves if this is a designed campaign or merely rtuitous.

Lord Riddell was the recognized link between the Government and the ress during the War. It is characteristic that even when Mr. Asquith as Prime Minister he seems to have had little direct contact with the ress. Mr. Lloyd George, whatever office in the Government he happened be occupying, always seems to have been in the closest communication ith Lord Riddell. The result is that this Diary not merely lets us see Mr. oyd George at work, but gives the most intimate account we have yet d about his wartime life and activities. There was rarely a day when ord Riddell did not lunch, dine, or play golf with "the man who won the ar". His admiration for him appears on most of the pages of this Diary. us in May, 1916 :

> L. G., like all politicians, possesses a firm belief in himself and his power and ability to cope with difficulties. Self-confidence is necessarily part of the politician's stock-in-trade ; without it he could not carry on. L.G. often says Asquith is not a War Minister, and although he does not add, as he might well do, that he himself has the capacity, obviously is fully assured he has.

year later he writes :

> I think his executive powers his strong point. His courage, patience, tenacity, energy, tact, industry, power of work, and eloquence combine to make him an administrator of the first order. And to these should be added his charm of manner, his power of observation, and his ruthless method of dismissing inefficients. These qualities are especially valuable at a time of emergency like the present. He sees something to be done, and he does it well and quickly. His schemes are another matter. . . .
>
> He is a remarkable combination of forces ; an orator and a man of action. His energy, capacity for work, and power of recuperation are remarkable. He has an extraordinary memory, imagination, and the art of getting at the root of a matter. What the military call the *coup d'œil*. He is not afraid of responsibility, and has no respect for tradition or convention. He is always ready to examine, scrap, or revise established theories and practices. These qualities give him unlimited confidence in himself. He has a remarkably quick, alert, and logical mind, which makes him very effective in debate. He is one of the craftiest of men, and his extraordinary charm of manner not only wins him friends, but does much to soften the asperities of his opponents and enemies.

It is worth noting that Lord Riddell seems to have been careful to keep the right side of the Prime Minister. When Mr. Lloyd George related analogy which he had employed in a speech, "I said, 'A very pre analogy', but privately I doubted its accuracy". Once or twice, too, suspects the Diary's accuracy. Could Sir John Fisher, for example, ha had a ship in 1860?

The Diary is, of course, extremely interesting. When once started it we could not lay it down. All the great personalities of the period fla before us. There is Robertson Nicoll telling Mr. Balfour of the trans tion of one of his books, giving him his first introduction to Mrs. Floren L. Barclay and Charles Garvice, and saying that, apart from novels, had not had six good books submitted to him, but had had to suggest boo to suitable authors. We have Dr. Clifford at 78 saying that he was ne vous and uneasy about making a speech but never when preaching in h own pulpit. Clifford, by the way, said Gladstone had told him he w "always nervous except when replying to an attack, when he forgot about himself". Robertson Nicoll, Mr. Lloyd George, and Lord Ridd

> all agreed that Spurgeon was the greatest preacher we had heard. It w also agreed that the late Victorian preachers of all denominations we much superior to those of the present time.

Mr. Balfour held there was no occasion for Asquith to read his speeche as he

> always expressed himself perfectly. He always used the right word. never used the word which is worth ten words, but he frequently used word which is worth one and a half. . . . A. B. spoke highly of L. G., a said that he was interesting because he had so many styles of orator violent, wheedling, and humorous—and in all he was equally good. He Asquith made a remarkable combination. Each had what the other lack Asquith possessed great judgment, great dexterity and a wide, capaci mind; L. G., vehement fire, power of action, and tact.

The Diary will take its part as one of the documents for historians of War.

So will Mr. Nicolson's discouraging and depressing book. In it describes how, a young diplomatist with ideals, believing in Presid Wilson and his Fourteen Points, he went with the British delegation Paris, only to be swiftly disillusioned. Together with the diary he kep the time, he now reprints his subsequent reflections, in which he seems exaggerate the extent of his disappointment at Wilson's failure to st firm for his policy against the European Powers, especially Italy. Lloyd George emerges much more creditably than most readers will an pate. Mr. Nicolson questions

> whether any British statesman then alive could, given the state of pub opinion at home, have achieved, or rather, have avoided, so much.

The book is written with the intention of helping any who may ha to take part in a Peace Conference in future. Mr. Nicolson believes th a good deal was lost in that no one went to the Council with a defin plan : "the worst individual design is better than a fusion of four". calculates that

> 30 per cent of the total energy of the Supreme Council was taken up executive functions, that some 10 per cent was wasted on unnecessa detail, and that some 40 per cent was devoted to preventing a breach tween one or other of the Allies. The remaining 20 per cent was expend upon the task of making peace.

He argues that "the essential to good diplomacy is precision", and h the new diplomacy failed, for everything was vague, which is the wors

all possible faults. Open against secret diplomacy, the democratic against the expert conduct of international affairs, is bound to fail. The tragedy of Versailles was caused by the difficulty of

> adjusting the emotions of the masses to the thoughts of the rulers . . . . What the statesman thinks to-day, the masses may well feel to-morrow. Yet in conditions such as those of the Peace Conference, requiring extreme rapidity of solution, the time-lag between the emotions of the masses and the thoughts of the statesmen is a most disadvantageous factor.

The book is full of pen pictures of men and scenes, of which the following is a good example. Brockdorff Rantzau had failed to stand up at a ceremony when replying to Clemenceau, not through *hubris,* but because he was on the verge of collapse.

> I ask A. J. B. whether he shares the general horror and indignation. "What indignation?" he says. "Oh, about Brockdorff Rantzau's conduct yesterday." "What conduct?" "His not standing up when replying to Clemenceau." "Didn't he stand up? I failed to notice. I make it a rule never to stare at people when they are in obvious distress." A. J. B. makes the whole of Paris seem vulgar.

Dr. Sherwood Eddy's book follows his *The Challenge of Russia.* Though there are many signs that he has written in a hurry—one note is in quite the wrong place—the march of events has nevertheless been too quick for him, both in Germany and in regard to "technocracy". While we share Dr. Eddy's general outlook, there is much in the chapter on Britain which suggests that readers must be wary in assuming he is always an accurate observer or interpreter; neither about our National Government nor about Mr. Lloyd George are his statements sufficiently judicial. It is revealing to place his paragraphs side by side with Mr. Nicolson's.

In his survey of the European countries Dr. Eddy notes once more the enthusiasm and optimism of Russian youth; he contrasts the banking system of Great Britain, where not one bank has failed during the depression, with that of the United States, where 10,484 have failed. To him both Russia and the rest of Europe present their challenge to America.

> If Russia can insure its unemployed and then eliminate unemployment altogether, the question will become unescapable: Cannot the United States do the same and if not, why not? . . . . If Russia has an ultimate plan for the housing of all its workers, and if a city like Vienna can end its slums forever, why are American cities' slums so sodden, so sordid, so inexcusable, and why has not a single city in North America a plan for abolishing this social pestilence? If the Soviet Union can have clean, wholesome, morally educative moving picture films, why cannot the United States? . . . .
>
> America presents a challenge to Europe by its more efficient mechanization while Europe challenges America by its more advanced socialization. The United States has developed the machine; Europe has made more provision for the human factor. America has created wealth; Europe has provided security. . . . Socialization without violence is possible only if it comes in time. It is a question of socialization without delay by parliamentary means, or socialization by revolution. This is the challenge of Europe.
>
> EDITOR.

The Queen and Mr. Gladstone. By PHILIP GUEDALLA. Hodder. Vol. I: 1845-1879. 25s.

The most important of the 6,000 communications which passed between Queen Victoria and Mr. Gladstone were published in *The Letters of Queen Victoria,* but much of value remained. In this volume Mr. Philip Guedalla now prints 625 documents, of which only 91 have previously seen the light. In the main they deal with the ministry of 1868-1874, midway in which there

seems to have begun the dislike of the statesman which made the Quee treat him so shamefully in after years.

Mr. Guedalla's very skilful Introduction emphasizes the difference b tween three Queens—the lively girl Victoria I, who leaned on Lord Me bourne; the austere, proper Victoria II, who leaned on Albert; the Empres Victoria III, moulded and transformed by the wizard Benjamin. In hi Introduction Mr. Guedalla, like a clever Jack Horner, draws out the plums all the while enabling us to see how unlikely it was that the Queen and he greatest Prime Minister should ever be sympathetic spirits. The Quee was a woman with a great idea of her own dignity; Gladstone was incline to be ponderous, and, as he recognized, "a man so eager upon things a not enough to remember always what is due to persons". It was unfortu nate, too, that the years of his ministry coincided with a period of emo tional and physical stress in the Queen's life. She was always talking about her health, lamenting that she was the only person in the land who could get no rest, and refusing to be "*teased* and *tormented*" to open Par liament and appear before her subjects. Her doctor, Sir William Jenner, seems to have encouraged her to nurse herself, though it was not Glad stone, but her Secretary, General Grey, who most strongly urged that there should be more public appearances—"all that she says of the 'weight of work', 'weakened health'—'shattered nerves', *etc.*—has simply no effect whatever on me". Gladstone recognized the situation—

> will lies at the root of many human and especially of many feminine com plaints . . . fanciful ideas of a woman about her own health, encouraged b a feeble-minded doctor, become realities to [the] effect of producing in considerable degree the incapacity which but for them would not exist.

With marvellous patience Gladstone handled the querulous Queen, trying to get her to open Parliament or Blackfriars Bridge, or take a more activ part in public life. He tried his best, too, to persuade her to employ th Prince of Wales in some way which would fit him for his life work, bu here he met a brick wall, though the Queen admitted (in 1872)

> the P. of W. has *never* been fond of reading and . . . from his earliest year it was *impossible* to get him to do so. Newspapers and *very rarely*, a novel, are all he ever reads.

Glimpses are seen of the Queen as "Protestant to the very *heart's core*" or appalled at the idea of women qualifying for medicine—

> to propose that they sh^ld study with men—things w^h c^ld not be named before them—certainly not *in a mixed audience*—w^ld be to introduce total disregard of what must be considered as belonging to the rules an principles of morality.

We see her frequently alarmed at railway accidents, and urging fewe trains, slower speed, and luggage trains on their own lines.

This volume closes before Gladstone returned to lead the affairs of the nation in 1880, by which time Disraeli had "the Fairy" completely under his magic spell, but already we marvel at his endurance as the Queen bom barded him with complaints, interfered with matters of State, and made a hard task infinitely harder.

The volume is well-produced and well edited; apart from the attribution of the wrong Latin motto to Robert Lowe we have noticed no slip. It is unfortunate, however, that we have to wait for Volume II for the Index.

EDITOR.

The Gospel in the Early Church. By JAMES MACKINNON, Ph.D., D.D., D.Th., LL.D. Longmans. 16s.

Professor Mackinnon has followed up his book on *The Historic Jesus* with "a study of the early development of Christian thought" (to quote the

subtitle). It traverses the whole ground of the *New Testament* and the "Apostolic Fathers", thus avoiding the unreal isolation of the later canonical writings from other writings standing near to them in time and in general outlook. The line is rightly drawn between this whole body of literature and the Apologists who mark a fresh stage. Thus the book provides a comprehensive survey of the movement of Christian thought down to the middle of the second century. In matters of "higher criticism" the author represents the generally accepted positions of moderate liberalism. In interpretation also he follows well-trodden tracks. He is, it is hardly necessary to say, thoroughly acquainted with the latest work on the subject, but he is not sympathetic with recent tendencies. For him, as for the Harnack school, the essence of Christianity is to be found in selected portions of the teaching of Jesus as given in the Synoptic Gospels, and the rest of the *New Testament* represents in the main a greater or less degree of "speculative" expansion, obscuring rather than enforcing the original Gospel. For this, of course, Paul is made chiefly responsible. His greatness as a religious personality, and his services to the freedom and universality of the Gospel, are acknowledged, but Dr. Mackinnon is clearly ill at ease with his "mysticism" (which he attributes to an idiosyncrasy, combined with alien influences), and he thinks poorly of his equipment as a theologian: 'his historic sense was weak"; "he had not the philosophic mind or temperament"; he was too much of a rabbi; he believed in a "crass" superstition about sacrifice; he bungled over the problem of divine sovereignty and human freedom; and he introduced into Christianity a "speculative Gnostic element" which was "a questionable contribution to the faith of the nascent Church". His worst offence would seem to have been the invention of a 'cosmic Christology", which he somehow succeeded in fastening upon other Christian thinkers, like the authors of the Fourth Gospel and *Hebrews*, thereby leading Christian theology into a wilderness from which it is only now emerging.

All this is familiar enough. The question is, whether it is really an historical account of the way in which Christian thought moved during its first century-and-a-half. No doubt theological sympathies and antipathies will always count for something in our reconstruction of that period, and Dr. Mackinnon clearly does not like Paul, or John very much. Those who do, will be likely to judge differently. But we may fairly ask certain questions. Was Paul quite such a helpless prey of "influences" as he is sometimes represented? Did he occupy (whether for good or ill) such a lonely eminence among early Christian thinkers? Can the genius of the Fourth Gospel be adequately summed up as "deutero-Pauline"? Is there not a vital connexion between the eschatological teaching in the Synoptics (which Dr. Mackinnon finds uncongenial, as we know from his former book) and the "mysticism" of Paul and John? Was not, in fact, primitive Christian thought—was not even the teaching of Jesus—less simple than he allows, and did it not already contain elements which necessarily called for such interpretations as we find in Paul, John and *Hebrews*? If so, then even the "cosmic Christology" may be something more than mere wanton speculation", though it be not guaranteed by explicit sayings of Jesus, or by direct Christian experience. (How indeed could anyone "experience" the creation of the world?) Are we to lay down the canon that everything in Christian theology which is not so guaranteed is a foreign accretion? In any case, if Dr. Mackinnon is right, it is doubtful whether we can properly speak of "development" in early Christian thought; it is rather progressive depravation; and we should go to the *New Testament* writers rather to be warned by their misunderstandings than to be enlightened by their insight into the Gospel of Christ.

The book is from its own standpoint a clear, straightforward, co... spicuously candid piece of work, learned, careful, and accurate in detail, a... never leaving the reader in doubt about the author's meaning, or about t... degree of confidence with which he offers his judgment upon each questi... that arises. Here we may learn how one dominant school of Briti... theology, in the person of one of its most distinguished representative... reacts to various elements in historic Christianity as set forth in the earlie... literature of the Church.

C. H. Dodd.

The Original Jesus. By Otto Borchert. Lutterworth Press. 12s. 6d.

Dr. Borchert's book, originally published in German, has had a strang... history. Having been rejected by publishers some ten times, it found it... opportunity in the war and the subsequent so-called peace. It passe... through several editions in German, and, after having been translated int... Dutch, Danish, and Swedish, it now appears in English, and, to use th... words of its editor, claims to offer

> to the man in the street in language free from all theological technicalitie... a study of the Gospel picture—fresh, profound and comprehensive—whic... makes Jesus live before the reader's eyes.

That claim is not unjustified, though most readers of the book will probab... agree that what they mainly have to do with is Dr. Borchert's own idea ... the story of Jesus. But it is a great idea and one that has been verified ... the writer's own experience, and therefore comes with all the force of ... genuine revelation.

The book falls into two main parts. The first is entitled "The Foolis... ness in the Picture of Jesus: its value in the scientific defence ... Christianity", and here the writer claims that the Gospel story of Jesus ... supported and verified by the fact of the offence which it created and st... creates. He deals with the various reactions in history to the work ... Christ, *e.g.*, those of Greece and the Orient, of Germanism and of t... Papacy. In all these cases Dr. Borchert argues that the very difficulti... which men have had in accepting the claims of Christ and their misinte... pretations of them may be made to support the historicity and reality ... the Bible story. The second part of the book deals with "The Beauty ... the Picture: the glory of Jesus exhibited anew to scorners and admirers" ... and contains a very fresh and interesting study of the personality, co... sciousness, and teaching of Jesus as set forth in the Gospels. The gene... conclusion of the whole may be expressed in Dr. Borchert's own words:

> The moral gift (example) in Jesus is not so important to us as t... religious gift in its permanence. It is for us to experience him as the o... who leads us to the Father, who brings forgiveness of sins, who has pow... over evil spirits, and has conquered death. Make use of Jesus in the sens... in which he gave himself—as saviour, as light, as fresh vital power. Then ... in experiencing him your knowledge of Jesus will continue to be perfected.

What Dr. Borchert has himself found in Jesus Christ he thus seeks to pas... on to others, and his work breathes the spirit of the best type of Germa... Protestant piety. His attitude is often naïve and uncritical to a degree ... but it nevertheless represents something very real and very great in th... writer's own life. This impression is increased by his abundant illustra... tions from modern literature and life, and the book may well take its plac... as a real and timely contribution to a theme of supreme importance.

W. B. Selbie.

The Christ of the Christian Faith. By W. Douglas Mackenzie. Macmillan. $2.00.

This book contains the substance of lectures which Dr. Mackenzie delivered in America, some in 1928 and others in 1904. He has now revised and brought them up to date, and they will surely take their place as an important and characteristic contribution to the study of a subject of perennial interest. In its general range and method the book recalls the famous work of Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu* ("The Self-consciousness of Jesus"), and it also recalls Forsyth's great work, *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ,* to which Dr. Mackenzie pays a very high and well-deserved tribute. This implies that the book is a discussion of the problem of the Person of Jesus Christ. It is in the first instance a study of His historic personality, work, and teaching. This occupies the main part of the volume, and leads up to the discussion of the historic Christ as creator of the Church and as the moral regenerator of humanity. There is a final chapter giving a sketch of apostolic Christology and summarizing a good deal of the most recent work on the subject. Dr. Mackenzie's general contention is that in order to get any true view of the Person of Jesus Christ we must go back to history and

> examine more closely, deeply and candidly the conditions under which the divine self-consciousness took hold of the conditions of a human experience,

and he believes that it is only as we accept the deity of Christ "with all its vast, glorious mystery" that we can find an explanation of historic Christianity. While he realizes that to the modern mind the Incarnation cannot be adequately expressed in the terms of the ancient creeds, he believes that any re-interpretation of it which is at once distinctive of the thought of our day and able to appeal to it will live as it is concerned not merely with the human Christ, but with one who was very God as well as very man. We cannot but wish that Dr. Mackenzie had formulated this position for himself rather more fully and deliberately than he has done, but we may be grateful to him for a book which is a very complete and careful collection of materials on this doctrine even though the positive statement of the doctrine may leave something to be desired.

W. B. Selbie.

Sacraments of Simple Folk. By R. R. Marett. Oxford Press. 10s.

Phases in the Religion of Ancient Rome. By Cyril Bailey. Oxford Press. 15s.

A year ago Dr. Marett published his first series of Gifford Lectures under the title *Faith, Hope and Charity in Primitive Religion.* The second series now before us suggests that the author has kept the best to the last. The lectures may be described as a very comprehensive study of the whole sacramental idea in primitive and savage religion. Dr. Marett is an anthropologist and believes that there is "nothing like leather". At the same time he is very far from interpreting his task narrowly. Much of the fascination of his work lies in its broad outlook and in the generous way in which the author uses his primitive data to throw light on human life and nature as we know it.

For his purposes as an anthropologist Dr. Marett defines a sacrament as

> any rite of which the specific object is to consecrate or make sacred. More explicitly, this means any rite which by way of sanction or positive blessing invests a natural function with a supernatural authority of its own.

In reply to the objection that sacrament for Christians is a hallowed expression of very special significance, he argues quite justifiably that

Christianity itself borrowed the term and cannot now rightfully denomi- tionalize it. Savages feel, if they do not think, sacramentally. In oth- words, for them life is full of the sacred, and it is a matter of deep- interest to discover the various ways in which their sense of the sacred fin- expression and practically shapes their conduct. The first of what I Marett calls the natural functions which come to have a sacramental signi- cance is that of eating. For the savage the quest of food is all-importa , and it is quite natural that round the getting and preparing of food shou gather rites which symbolize the desire of primitive man to be at one wi the powers that provide the food. The various ways in which this is carri out and the significance of the accompanying ritual Dr. Marett describ s not only with abundant illustrations from savage practices but wi a humorous appreciation of it all that makes him very delightful readin . The other natural functions with which he deals are fighting, matin , educating, ruling, judging, covenanting, healing, and dying. This wi e range of subjects gives him an opportunity for studying the relation of th e sacred to every phase and incident in the life of primitive man. His boo is therefore much wider in range than its title would suggest, and take with its predecessor in the Gifford series is a contribution of first-rat importance to the study of anthropology, particularly in relation to mora s and religion.

Of the making of books on the history of religion there is no end: th are all welcome, and none more than these lectures by Mr. Cyril Bailey o religion in ancient Rome. Mr. Bailey believes that "the story of the d - velopment of religious ideas is the most important part of human history , and his aim in these lectures is to seek out and describe the primiti e elements which went to make up the religion of the Roman people. So deals in the first lecture with Magic, Spell, and Taboo, and in the next tw lectures passes on to deal with Belief in and Worship of Spirits. Th follow two lectures on Gods, Native and Foreign, and their Cults; t sixth lecture deals with Emotion and Mysticism, especially in relation Oriental Cults, the seventh with Philosophy, Epicurean and Stoic, and t eighth with Syncretism and Superstition.

This list of subjects shows what a vast field Mr. Bailey attempts t cover. He is thoroughly at home in it, he knows his subject through a through, and can illustrate from literature or inscriptions every point h makes. He has an admirable style and never loses himself in the forest details, and he carries the reader's interest with him all the time and wi his assent by the cautious sanity of his judgment. One interesting po that emerges again and again is the way in which Roman religion, once joyous agricultural and household faith, became stereotyped and petrifi in the hands of State officials. As Mr. Bailey says:

> The Roman Iuppiter had in his supreme position the germs of a Mono theism, which philosophy later turned to good religious purpose. But his place in the religion of the state he had become little else than its ow impersonation; he had swamped and obscured the other cults and the lesser ideas of true religious significance for which they stood, and was himsel a symbol of a religion essentially political. In all these ways institutionalism at Rome had killed the common instinct which it was intended to foster.

This book is an indispensable companion to Warde Fowler's well known *Religious Experience of the Roman People* and should be in th hands of every student of the life and mind of ancient Rome.

W. B. Selbie.

David Hume. By B. M. Laing. **Berkeley.** By G. Dawes Hicks. Benn. 12s. 6d. each.

These two books fulfil excellently the aim of the "Leaders of Philosophy" series—to introduce students to the teaching of the makers of Western philosophic thought. Prof. Dawes Hicks's *Berkeley* is a masterpiece of exposition and criticism. The brief biography conveys the charm of the great bishop's personality. A full account of his three productive periods with a summary of the works follows. In the next chapter, on the "Essay Towards a New Theory of Vision", there is clearly shown Berkeley's failure to establish the complete disparity between the visible and the tangible, the contention which had such consequences both for his psychology and for his philosophy in general. His new principle, the famous 'existence is *percipi*", is then described and related to the teaching of Descartes, and especially of Locke; and his sharp divergence from the latter towards Nominalism and a denial of the reality of abstract ideas, is indicated. The inconsistencies of thinkers like Hume and Berkeley are even more interesting than their logical thought, because in the former they are seen struggling with the inadequate psychology of their age, and at times breaking powerfully through the net of their own logic to the momentary freedom of standpoints attained later by philosophy. It is one example of this that, as Prof. Dawes Hicks points out, the extreme form of Berkeley's Nominalism was "a transient phase" in his thought. Thus he maintains the reality of general ideas, and even modifies his theory that *esse* is *percipi* in several important ways. One of these is his refusal to identify "things" with perceptions, and objects with ideas, which, however, he can only justify by recognizing "that the *esse* of a sensible thing must imply more than its being merely perceived by an individual percipient", and that "the content perceived is not exhaustive of the 'thing' in its reality". Here and elsewhere, in fact, he can be seen endeavouring, without realizing it, to escape from the subjectivism which his psychology forced upon his philosophy, towards "the principle of the duality of subject and object", as our author quotes Dr. James Ward. So in many passages he tends to regard the mind as a unity in which imagination, will, and even cognition, are modes of its activity; and Prof. Dawes Hicks strikingly affirms, in dealing with the "Final Phase of his Philosophical Reflexion", that the whole drift of his later thought was towards a

> dislodgment of sense perception from the place it occupied in the empirical theory, and, in conjunction therewith, towards recognition of conceptual thought in cognitive apprehension generally.

An example of the same tendency is seen in Berkeley's remarkably modern theory of the will, in which it appears not as a faculty the self has, but *as* the self, the individual expressing himself in particular ways—the first essential to a satisfactory theory of freedom. On the other hand, the author brings out distinctly Berkeley's inability on his principles to solve the problems of the relation of finite minds to the Infinite Mind, or of finite minds to each other. His account of Berkeley's religious views is sympathetic; and not only is the familiar course of thought admirably traced from his philosophy to the scepticism of Hume and the criticism of Kant, on the one hand, and to the idealistic philosophers, on the other, but there is an absolute miniature history of recent philosophy in the final chapter.

In Dr. Laing's *Hume* the personality of the philosopher bulks largely, the life story occupying about a fourth of the volume, while there is a further biographical interest in his defence of Hume from the generally accepted view of him as both philosophically and religiously a sceptic. The biographical is a legitimate approach; and, as Hume is not so much an

original genius as a somewhat uncouth, powerful reflection of his ti... the light thrown upon his thought by the picture of the man in his envir...ment is perhaps worth the sacrifices Dr. Laing has made in the interc...s of compression. We regret the compression a little, as when in the per...timate chapter, "The Philosophical Significance of Hume's Theory", ... the nine pages are occupied with the theories of Descartes, Locke, a...d Berkeley, except a half-page given to a summary of Hume's principl... In the philosophical part of the book, however, the well-known outlines ...f his subject's system are clearly laid down, and the equally familiar inco...sistencies in which its uncompromising sensationalist theory lands t...e philosopher are carefully indicated.

The author is not wholly convincing in his endeavours to prove th...t Hume was neither a philosophic sceptic nor an irreligious man and to sho...w that he had a constructive system of philosophy. As to Hume's vie...s on religion, his rare favourable references can be accounted for ...y the Scottish caution and desire to give no unnecessary offence, whi...h accompanied his similarly national dour courage in adhering to the log...c of his principles; his conclusions in the "Dialogues" are notoriously am...biguous, and in the historical works his treatment of religion is emphati...cally not that of a man who has any reverence for it. Nor does one find t...e argument that Hume was aiming at a *via media* between scepticism a...nd Deism, and was throughout even attacking the sceptical position, a...y more conclusive. The positive side of the author's view is his contenti...on that Hume has a constructive system of philosophy, embodied in his pri...nciples of human nature and in his empiricism as applied to these. It is ...e fact, as all commentators point out, that Hume imagined himself to ...e constructing a systematic philosophy of human nature, analogous to Ne...wton's system of physical nature; but the majestic laws of Newton's d...iscovery have no parallel at all in Hume's vague constructive effo...rts. Wherever we follow the latter's empiricism we find ourselves met by ...n admission of ignorance, which a later age would call agnosticis...m; "association", "custom" as applied to causality, "causality" itself, ...all lead to the inexplicable; and even reason "is nothing but a wonderful ...and unintelligible instinct in our souls". In imagination, the prominence ...of which in Hume's thought is rightly emphasized by Dr. Laing, there ...is indeed an approach to a positive constructive principle, but it is only s...een in that dim agnostic way which Hume's atomistic conception of the mi...nd as a bundle of sense impressions renders inevitable.

JOHN MURPHY.

History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon, being an Inquiry ...the text of some English Manuscripts of the Vulgate Gospels. By ... H. GLUNZ. Cambridge Press. 18s.

That the Vulgate New Testament as it left the hands of Jerome i... where it differs from Old-Latin MSS, an excellent authority for the rea...dings of good fourth century Greek MSS, became increasingly clear ... Harnack in the later years of his life. Dr. Glunz, who admits that ... MSS later than the ninth century have any real authority in the reco...stitution of Jerome's actual text, is not, however, concerned with the Vu...gate Gospels as they left the hands of Jerome, but with the form or form...s they took in England during the definite period indicated on his title-pag...

His earlier work, *Britannien und Bibeltext* (Leipzig, 1930), with ... fascinating coloured maps, merits translation into English, but the prese...nt work is quite new. It is, in fact, pioneer work of the best kind, which ... on this side of the channel may well be ashamed not to have carried o... ourselves. The author has made a close study of numerous Vulgate MS...

n England, has classified them, and has endeavoured to show how their exts have been influenced by the work of medieval exegetes and thinkers, ow in fact they were adapted to fulfil the missionary and propagandist urposes for which they were prepared. This subject is, therefore, really f more importance to the historian than to the textual critic, and is reated in a most interesting and readable manner. Six appendixes are evoted to transcripts of documents or to collations. Students of earlier ulgate MSS will be especially grateful for the recollation of MS X (Corpus hristi College, Cambridge, 286).

On p. xiv it would have been well to state what relationship, if any, ıbsists between the "Leofric Gospels" and *The Gospel Book of Lan-evennec* (*The Harkness Gospels*) *in the New York Public Library* by . R. Morey, E. K. Rand, C. H. Kraeling (Cambridge, Harvard Univer-ty Press, 1931); p. xvii (No. 48), the number of the Phillipps MS is miss-ıg; p. 83, not "Turino", but "Turin" or "Torino"; p. 102, on the whole uestion of Haymo and Remigius the author does not appear to know iggenbach's detailed discussion in Zahn's *Forschungen,* VIII Teil eipzig, 1907); p. 231, n. 1, for *Bekker* read *Becker.*

A. Souter.

uthority and Reason in the Early Middle Ages. By A. J. Macdonald, D.D. Oxford Press. 6s.

Dr. Macdonald's Hulsean Lectures for 1931 will receive a welcome from l serious students of the Middle Ages. They throw a penetrating light ı some of the most unfamiliar parts of the most unfamiliar centuries. hey help to correct some widespread and deep-rooted errors. They point e way to a better understanding of the main course of medieval thought.

With the meticulous learning and sympathetic insight which his earlier oks have taught us to expect from him, Dr. Macdonald examines the eedom allowed for rational investigation and discussion from the middle the eighth to the end of the eleventh century. The authority of Holy ripture was not questioned in this period, and learned opinion was vided mainly over the alternative methods of interpreting it. Dr. Mac-nald shows the antithesis, which gradually became more clear, between e dialectical method inherited from the logic of the ancient world and e method which relied on "authority". The notion of "authority" it-lf is seen to develop until it included the Fathers, the four General Coun-s, contemporary provincial synods, and finally the *ad hoc* pronounce-nts of the Roman See. The role which that See claims for itself in the odern world as inherently its own by Divine commission was, Dr. Mac-nald reminds us, in the beginning almost forced upon it by such ovincial bishops as Hincmar of Reims. To crush what he took to be unsound use of dialectic, Hincmar relied in a lawyerlike way on thorities, and he found in Rome an appropriate centre for them. The tory of the authoritarian party was slow; the protests against it ring cannily like those of the sixteenth century; but its decisive triumph took ace at the Lateran Council of 1215. This "registered the establishment the Papacy as the adjudicator of doctrine" and "pointed forward to ent and the Vatican Council of 1870". Dr. Macdonald's conclusion is at in the so-called Dark Ages, before the authoritarian party won its tory and laid its trophies at the feet of the Pope, there was more intel-tual freedom than for some hundreds of years after 1215.

Dr. Macdonald's conclusion needs to be understood with reference to general setting in European history; but, so understood, it falls into e with much recent work on the Middle Ages. The papal monarchy and legalistic conception of Christianity against which the Reformers re-

volted was not, as critics and apologists alike used to represent it, a h... or venerable system approved by the Church's almost unanimous ... science for countless generations. The Reformers revolted against a ... machine hastily erected in the preceding three or four centuries—ere... not amid universal applause, but only after violent opposition. There ... much truth in Wyclif's contention that "for a thousand winters and mo... the Church had not known some of the abuses against which he labou... Wyclif, the Reformers, and the Evangelical Churches represent in t... different ways a point of view temporarily submerged at the end of ... Middle Ages, but in truth at least as ancient and authentic as the auth... tarian point of view.

One of the merits of the book is that it presents as part of a coher... story such individuals as Gottschalk, Ratramn, and Berengar. These ... often appear as isolated and almost meaningless for the general devel... ment of thought, but even John the Scot, in Dr. Macdonald's hands, cea... to be a sort of intellectual Melchisedec without predecessors or success... Dr. Macdonald explodes yet again the favourite fable of the more vul... Roman and Anglo-Catholic controversialist—the fancy that belief in ... literal inspiration of Holy Scripture is a Protestant dogma invented, ... Predestination, by John Calvin in such time as he could spare from bu... ing Servetus. In some of the most interesting passages in his lectures ... Macdonald shews the kinship between the work of these early dialect... theologians and that of Barth and Brunner. We hope that he will deve... the ideas which he throws out here in passing. The only serious critic... which we have to make is that Dr. Macdonald's own familiarity with ... authors makes him forget how much help the general reader needs. ... book suffers from over-compression and from the absence of a suffic... number of sign-posts which he who runs may read.

We end by quoting an eleventh century prayer, pathetic and "mode... in its scepticism and interesting as shewing

> in a remarkable manner that tendency to unbelief which is sometimes ... far from the minds of those who build on ecclesiastical authority in ir... pretation.

Otloh of St. Emmeran prays:

> Oh! if thou existest Almighty, and if thou art anywhere, as I have ... read in many books, show, I pray who thou art, and what thou canst ... delivering me quickly from imminent dangers, for I cannot support lo... such great decisions.

B. L. MANNING.

The Carthusian Order in England. By E. MARGARET THOMPSON. S.P.C. ... 21s.

For many Englishmen Chartreuse means a drink and Carthusian... public-school boy: here is the book to enlighten such Philistines. To re... profitably this most substantial, learned, and informing volume is a ve... considerable labour, but it is labour well repaid. The title indeed does l... than justice to the scope of the book, for here are described, as a bac... ground for the story of the Carthusians in England, the beginnings a... early development of the Order at La Chartreuse, the primitive custo... and the three versions of the Rule. We see how a loosely connected co... pany of hermits, each living a life of meditation in his own way, tra... formed itself stage by stage into a closely-knit Order with an increasi... common life.

There were in England at the time of the suppression nine Carthus... houses (commonly called Charterhouses): Witham, Hinton, Beauv...

(Notts.), London, Hull, Coventry, Axholme, Mountgrace (Yorks.), and Sheen. In only one of these, Mountgrace, does enough of the monastic building remain to give any adequate notion of a typical Charterhouse. The central part of the book contains a detailed account of the fortunes of these nine houses, of their relations with the General Chapter, and of their libraries and their principal writers. There are notes concerning the house at Perth, which had but slight connexion with the English province, and concerning the Irish house. Of this latter the General Chapter wrote in 1321, with the frankness characteristic of medieval Churchmen,

> Let the priors of England . . . extract from the house of Ireland whatever they can in rents and sums of money, as it is useless to the Order.

The house had been sold to the Hospitallers. Everything did not go well in Ireland, it seems, even before Oliver Cromwell.

The story of the English houses has few striking incidents. The Carthusians, "never reformed because never deformed", moved less far from their original life of isolation than many Orders; in consequence they had comparatively little share in the public life of Church and State. The authoress does her best for them, but admits that they made little contribution to the external work or to the literature of the Church. The assessment made of their three hundred years' existence in England will depend on our judgment of asceticism. To the end they were comparatively free from abuses. They abandoned indeed their primitive simplicity, lived at least in moderate comfort, and, contrary to their early custom, undertook to pray for individuals outside the Order and to bury them, so becoming involved in some of the more squalid of late medieval controversies.

The third part of the book contains an account of the suppression. The introduction warns us that "the last part of this book differs in the nature of its contents to (*sic*) the rest". It differs even more in tone. Whilst the authoress deals with medieval times she uses the sober language of the historian; when she passes to Tudor times, perhaps because she follows the language as well as the narrative of Chauncy's *Passio XVIII Carthusianorum*, her chapters resemble those edifying booklets full of the nauseating and aromatic piety of the more hysterical "Catholic" hagiologists. The Carthusians of the sixteenth century are no longer mere "monks" as St. Bruno and St. Hugh were; they are "venerable fathers". They do not "await" events; they "piously await" them. They do not "die"; they "pass to the place of refreshment". No Calvinistic Churchman wishes any author to whitewash the self-styled Supreme Head in earth of the Church of England, but we regret that these last chapters sink to an almost Belloc level in their presentation of the sixteenth century as a simple struggle between darkness and light. The bravery of the eighteen Carthusians cannot be over-estimated, nor the horror of their deaths, but the historian will remember that hanging, drawing, and quartering was not a Protestant invention. It was in "merrye catholic" England the normal punishment of men condemned for treason, and public exhibitions of it did not revolt the "catholic" conscience till it was applied to the wrong victims.

Eighteen Carthusians died for the sake of papal supremacy. This, we are told, was a larger number of martyrs than any of the larger monastic Orders produced. An Englishman must deplore the manner in which the monasteries were dissolved, and must hold in contempt most of the creatures who did Henry's work; but when he compares the way in which these things were done in England with the way in which they were done in countries and ages constantly held up for his admiration he will find that, as usual, there is substantial cause for his alleged smugness and self-satisfac-

tion. The horrors of Henry's reign, shocking as they are to Englishme pale beside the treatment of the Templars by Philip the Fair in the "Ages Faith" or the treatment of the Russian clergy by the "enlightened" of o own day. When the events of the sixteenth century in England are s beside comparable revolutions elsewhere in medieval or modern histor the tone of these last chapters seems a little hysterical.

The book would be less difficult reading if the authoress had been a lit bolder in deciding which documents to print in full in the text, which summarize, and which to print in notes and appendixes. Almost all a printed in the text with conventional legal verbiage in full. This mak unnecessarily slow going, and does not add to our sense of security. The are a few untidy sentences; we suspect a slip between £100 and £1,000 o pp. 232-3 and 239; but almost everywhere the style is clear and the contr of an enormous mass of evidence both easy and scholarly. We leave th book feeling that we have learnt a great deal from an agreeable teache We only wish that she had humoured us by telling us more stories like th one about Peter of Cluny who tried to borrow books from La Chartreus "Do you send us, if you please", he wrote, "the larger volume of the ho father Augustine which almost at the beginning contains his letters to S Jerome, and those of St. Jerome to him. For a great part of ours when was in one of our obediences was accidentally devoured by a bear".

B. L. MANNING.

The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Oxford Movement. By W. H. MACKEAN, D.I Putnam. 6s.

Among the many books provoked by the Centenary of the Oxfo Movement this carefully written little volume deserves close attention. is shown what was the doctrine of Anglicans before the advent of the Tra tarians, what was their own doctrine, and what has been the doctrine the Anglo-Catholic party in later times. The book ends with what t author considers to be the results of the Eucharistic debate in the Chur of England during the last eighty years.

Anglican doctrine in the early part of the nineteenth century was eith virtualist, receptionist, or memorialist. Virtualism attributes a speci power of imparting grace to the elements after consecration. Receptioni maintains that the believing receiver obtains a special grace not particula through the elements but by means of the whole service. Memorialis means that the bread and wine as memorials of the sacrifice of Chr strengthen faith and profit the soul.

All Anglicans before the Tractarians were at one in repudiating t Roman doctrines of Transubstantiation and of the Sacrifice of the Mas The Tractarians had no thought at first of introducing any new doctrine the Eucharist; but as the movement went on there was more and mor approximation to Roman doctrine, led by such men as Hurrell Froude, un in the famous Tract 90 Newman attempted to reconcile both Transubstan tiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass with the Articles of the Church of Eng land. After Newman's secession to Rome the leadership of the movemen was in the hands of Pusey, whose doctrine in the end came to be hardl distinguishable from that of Rome. He held that as Christ is present unde the form of bread and wine, He is to be adored under that form.

After Pusey these views came to be the general belief of Angl Catholics; although there were many variations in detail. The latter pa of the nineteenth century saw great advances in ritual with the object teaching Anglo-Catholic doctrine by the symbolism of worship. In th twentieth century the outstanding point of this eucharistic practice ha

been the reservation of the elements, not merely for the purpose of communion, but for adoration in church.

Canon Mackean says in conclusion that the battle fought with Anglo-Catholics by Liberals and Evangelicals in the Church of England has shown that Anglo-Catholic eucharistic doctrine is neither traditional Anglicanism nor traditional Catholicism. A Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist in the sense of a consensus of the Fathers simply does not exist; and whatever Anglican doctrine was at any time before 1833, it was anti-Roman and altogether different from modern Anglo-Catholic doctrine.

The Canon's own doctrine is psychological. The words, elements, and acts are instinct with the personality of Jesus Christ and make Him vivid to us. Other words, elements, and acts would not have the same associations, and therefore would be less effective means of communion with Him. To protest against subjectivity in the interpretation of the Lord's Supper is to open the door to materialism. The only possible manifestation to our souls of a spiritual presence must be subjective; in other words, one that is felt by persons.

Altogether, the book is a valuable and useful study, both for the historical information condensed into it, and for the testimony it gives to the existence of a sound evangelicalism within the Church of England.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading).*

Mr. C. F. Andrews tells us that many readers of *What I Owe to Christ* wrote to him to say that in that book he had only described his active life in the world, and had not told about his inner life. He has therefore written *Christ in the Silence* (Hodder, 5s.) to tell of "Christ in the inmost heart". He explains how activity has always been one of his dangers, and how from the Gospel of John he has learnt to find the peace which passeth all understanding. The book is really a series of meditations on various passages in that Gospel, strongly autobiographical in tone, and illustrated largely from the writer's acquaintance with Sadhu Sundar Singh, Rabindranath Tagore, Mahatma Gandhi, and other Indians. It is written with fervour and faith, and with a *naïveté* which makes its own appeal. There is a moving picture of Dame Clara Butt singing the Negro spiritual, "Were you there when they crucified my Lord?" to Tagore at Santiniketan one evening, and several tributes to the influence of the Group Movement. A misprint on p. 264 should be corrected in the next edition.

In *The Heart of the Bible* Mrs. J. T. Davies proposes to print selected parts of the Bible (A.V.) in chronological order, with comment on the selected sections, thus combining "reading the Bible with learning to understand it". Vol. I (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) is entitled *The Literature of the Hebrew People,* and it is to be followed by two more volumes. The selection has been skilfully made, and the comment is both adequate and scholarly. The complete work will be of great service to teachers and students.

Sermons of the Year, 1932 (Faber, 7s. 6d.), edited by the Rev. W. F. Mead, contains 47 sermons by men of many Churches, including the Roman Catholic. Congregationalism is represented by Leyton Richards (a characteristic sermon on "A Christian Substitute for Armaments") and John Whale. Among other preachers are the Bishops of Birmingham and Durham, the Rev. Ronald Knox, Drs. L. P. Jacks, H. R. Mackintosh,

H. L. Simpson, the Rev. James Reid, and Mr. H. G. Wood. It is cle as one reads that the day of the preacher is not over.

The fervour of the Rev. R. Moffat Gautrey helps him to succeed wi the "evangelical interpretation" of the Poet Laureate's *The Everlasti Mercy,* even as he did with *The Hound of Heaven.* Preachers will do w to look at the book, which bears the title *The Burning Cataracts of Chri* (Epworth Press, 2s.).

Canon H. D. A. Major's *The Church's Creeds and the Modern M* in the "Modernist Series" (Skeffington, 3s. 6d.) is an admirable little boo which should be of special service to Free Churchmen, many of whom hav only vague ideas even of the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creed. An exposition of these Creeds is followed by a plea for the use of alte native modern creeds, some of which are examined.

Dr. Gordon Bottomley was given no easy task when he was asked t write a play for the celebration of the octo-centenary of Exeter Cathedra He chose for his subject *The Acts of St. Peter* (Constable, 3s. 6d.), Pete being the patron saint of the Cathedral, in which the play was performe on 27th June. It was conspicuously successful; the language is alway dignified and worthy; and there are passages of sublime pathos which we convey the Gospel story. Its only weakness is where it has been necessar to resort to cumbrous ways of avoiding the introduction of the figure Jesus; we see no reason why, in a play of this kind, Jesus should not ha spoken in the Gethsemane scene (p. 45).

Mr. E. H. Hayes has compiled two more volumes (N.S.S.U., 1s. eac of the "Yarns" teachers have found so useful. They are *More Yarns Christian Pioneers* and *Yarns on the Human Quest.*

Canon T. W. Pym's *Conduct* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) is an attempt "to equ its readers with a method of distinguishing between right and wro according to the standards of Christ". It is, on the whole, successf and may be recommended with confidence. Canon Pym is never "up the clouds"; he knows the problems that confront men and women to-da and brings a wise judgment to bear on them.

The Bishop of Barking's "Golden Lectures", *Evangelical Influence English Life* (Macmillan, 5s.) cover a great deal of ground—from the co tent of the Evangelical message and John Wycliffe to Shaftesbury, t abolition of slavery, and the Evangelical Missionary Societies. Dr. Insk is a good type of the *via media* bishop; he is never extreme or extravaga and says kind things about Nonconformists (while thinking they ought recognize that bishops are of the *bene esse* of the Church). A comparis between the Puritans of the 17th century and the Evangelicals of the 18 is suggestive, but cannot, we think, be altogether sustained.

There is little that is new in the Lectures, but they string beads alon a new string, and so are worth attention. Some words from a sermon Bishop Gore's are worthy of note.

> Baptism will not make you good; not all the sacraments will make yo good. . . But except ye . . . turn and become as little children, excep with that deliberate turning you welcome and accept the grace which He pu at your disposal, never shall you know what is the meaning of the regenera life, and what is conversion. . . In some cases it is sudden. . . But i the majority of cases the process is a gradual one. But, be it sudden or b it gradual, it is none the less necessary.

The Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England (Oxford Press 3s. 6d.) consists of four Lectures by the Rev. R. H. Malden, together wit an Appendix which is really a defence of Church Establishment. The le tures are popular and rather slapdash, but they give the ordinary reader

good deal of information not otherwise obtainable so easily. We hear, however, of the "secession" of 1662, when, we are told, 1,800 Presbyterian or Independent ministers "preferred to resign". And the Dean of Wells really should know how to spell "Stephens and Hunt"!

Mr. Kenneth G. Grubb knows South America as few people know it, and he has turned his labours on the *World Dominion* Survey to the very best advantage. His *From Pacific to Atlantic* (Methuen, 10s. 6d.) is everything that such a book ought to be. There is history, and geography, and economics, and description, a map, a good index, a touch of humour, and many illustrations, most of them from Mr. Grubb's own photographs. In fact, we do not know a better book to serve as an introduction to a study of South America. Our only complaint is that it does not state that the long quotation from Julio Navarro Monzo is from an article in *The Congregational Quarterly*.

Dr. J. T. Tucker, of the United Church of Canada, is responsible for *Angola* (*World Dominion* Survey, 5s. and 3s. 6d.), which is well supplied with illustrations, maps, and statistics. The survey shows what has been and is being done by Roman Catholic and Protestant Missions, and then outlines the unfinished task—there are 239 missionaries to a population of over 4,000,000 scattered over an area of half a million square miles.

The Rev. John Foster's *The Chinese Church in Action* (Livingstone Press, 2s.) describes the great opportunity there is in China to-day, and outlines the progress of the Five Year Movement.

We regret the first word in the title of Dr. Cyril Alington's *Final Eton Fables* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) but we trust that in his new sphere the Dean will be able to carry on the work he has so successfully performed at Eton. These "fables" are not uniformly happy, but we can imagine some of them—notably "The Saints' Hospital", "The Disappointment Book", and "A Dream of Judgment" "getting" the boys.

The aim of Principal W. Robinson's *Christianity is Pacificism* (Allen & Unwin, 4s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.) is to show that the Bible, interpreted as a progressive revelation, leads to a conception of God and His righteousness which amounts to a doctrine of non-resistance. With great sympathy with the conclusion reached, we must confess that we are not impressed by either the tone or the details of the argument: we think there is real ground for complaint that Principal Robinson lays far too much stress on the point where Jesus ceased reading *Isaiah* in the synagogue, while dealing inadequately with "the purging of the Temple". We note also that he does not appreciate the difference between "ravage" and "ravish".

Dr. Edward Glover's *War, Sadism, and Pacifism* (Allen & Unwin, 6s. 6d.) is a glaring example of the folly of carrying a good thing to extremes. Convinced that psychology and psycho-analysis reveal the causes of war, the author submits an "Outline of Research" which shows what a great field is open for investigation, but the whole business is thrown out of focus by the way in which every other element is subordinated to the psychological. This leads to such extreme demands as that there should be research "to find out how many dictators, Foreign Secretaries, diplomats and peace delegates suffer from psycho-sexual impotence or have a secret fear of impotence"!

Mr. Beverley Nichols's *Cry Havoc!* (Cape, 7s. 6d.), dedicated "To those Mothers Whose Sons Are Still Alive", is a strident pacifist plea which, we are sorry to feel, will convince nobody who is not a pacifist already. To that conclusion we have come because we are distressed by

the tone of the book, even when we have allowed for the fact that M. Nichols has probably decided that lurid propaganda is needed to make people realize the horrors of war. The main weakness of the book is that it has no background, despite Mr. Nichols's frequent references to his travels; we cannot complain, perhaps, of his failure to mention Calvin when talking of Geneva, but surely before going there he might have been expected to know very elementary things about the procedure at the League's sessions.

Nevertheless, when everything has been said in the way of criticism, it must be recognized that the book has much information to convey—about chemical warfare, the armaments interests, and so forth. The discussions he prints between the Quaker, Robert Mennel, and the Bengal Lancer, and between Sir Arthur Salter and Mr. G. D. H. Cole, contain much that is useful, while Sir Norman Angell's letter to Lord Beaverbrook, who evaded a reply, is packed with ammunition. It is not of more value in this direction, however, than Mr. Nichols's own reply to an undergraduate who had voted for the "Oxford resolution". The weakest section of the book is that dealing with "The Microbes of Mars", where we are told that "Patriotism is an Evil" and "war memorials are fever-spots", while to soldiers, Rupert Brooke's poems, and modern history books are all lumped together in indiscriminate criticism.

There is any amount of good stuff in *Christianity and the Crisis* (Gollancz)—indeed, over 600 pp. of it, and all for 5s. But we are not sure that readers will not be overwhelmed by this over-generous supply; certainly they will if they try to read through the volume at any speed. Dr. Percy Dearmer edits it, the Bishop of Ripon and Mr. Albert Mansbridge write the Introductory papers, four writers describe "The Present Chaos" and nine "What Christianity Is". Fifteen papers then show "The Christian Solution" in various parts of life, Canon F. R. Barry and the Archbishop of York bringing up the rear with "The Church in the World: Failures and Opportunities" and "The Conclusion of the Matter". The Congregational contributors to a remarkable enterprise are the Rev. Malcolm Spencer and Dr. Garvie.

It has been Sir Arthur Salter's habit to prepare memoranda on subjects which have come under his notice in his League of Nations work, both to clear his own mind and to set his views before his colleagues. Seventeen of these papers are printed in *The United States of Europe* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.), and they form fascinating reading, both because they let us see something of what goes on behind the scenes and because they enable us to test Sir Arthur's perspicacity. The papers range from 1919 to 1933, and they form a valuable commentary on international affairs since Versailles. The text of the Covenant is given to facilitate reference.

Lord Snowden has written a Preface to Mr. Joseph King's *The German Revolution: Its Meaning and Menace* (Williams & Norgate, 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.), which might be called a vade-mecum to the Nazi movement. It gives a summary account of the history of Germany since the Treaty of Versailles, and especially in recent months, and short sketches of the leading figures of German political life. Mr. King, as always, has strong convictions, which he is not afraid to state, but they do not minimize the value of his work. There is a slip on p. 42, where the interest on the Young Loan is said to be 5 per cent instead of 5½ per cent.

Mr. John Drinkwater's *This Troubled World* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.) contains four lectures delivered in the United States—"Man and the Machine", "Is It Peace?", "Speculation in Utopia", and "The Individual Soul". It will be seen that Mr. Drinkwater is not dealing with his own

subject but with social, political, and religious topics on which he would be the last to pose as an authority. The last essay (which has an unfortunate misprint on p. 88) is in essence a reply to Father Ronald Knox's *Caliban in Grub Street;* it is a plea for tolerance by one to whom "the revealed religion of the churches means nothing", but who professes a belief in God. Surely it was William of Wykeham who gave to New College the motto "Manners maketh Man", and not Cardinal Wolsey to Christ Church?

Herr Klaus Mehnert, the author of *Youth in Soviet Russia* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.), now translated into English, is a German, born in Russia in 1906, who speaks Russian as a second mother-tongue, and has spent the last four autumns in Russia mixing with Russian youth as one of themselves. The following paragraph is typical of his findings:

> I shall never forget the picture which a walk down the express during the long journey through Siberia offered me. The Germans, Americans and Frenchmen travelling first and second class were whiling away the time with a story-magazine, an Edgar Wallace thriller, or a yellow-backed novel; but the Russians in their "wooden class" were reading technical manuals and text-books of political economy, records of Party congresses, agitation pamphlets, works on agricultural science. The entire country seemed to be a vast school.

The book is packed with information and most interestingly written.

The title of Miss Hebe Spaull's *Youth of Russia To-day* (Nicholson & Watson, 3s. 6d.) suggests that the book covers the same ground as the one just reviewed. This is not so, for Miss Spaull, writing for young people, summarizes Russian geography, history, and literature as well as describes the life of Russia to-day. Her findings are crystallized in the dictum: "Youth has more influence in Soviet Russia than in any other land". It is not easy for adults to discern what is going on in Russia, and to describe the situation for children is hazardous indeed. Despite some mistakes, Miss Spaull has done the work very well.

Summary of the Fulfilment of The First Five-Year Plan for the Development of the National Economy of the U.S.S.R. (Moscow: U.S.S.R.; Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d. & 5s.) is the Report of the Soviet's State Planning Commission. It claims that in most spheres the Five-Year Plan has been over-fulfilled, and that in general it succeeded within the term of four and a quarter years. In the electrification of industry England has already been surpassed, and in the period the U.S.S.R. has removed from fifth place in the world to second. The Soviet Government is said to be the most firmly established in the world, and this table "of the physical volume of industrial output in 1932 (1928 = 100)" is given to contrast "victorious socialism and capitalism shaken by general and cyclic crises":

Capitalist world	67.
U.S.A.	57
Great Britain	89
Germany	57
France	74
U.S.S.R.	218.5

A long list of *Errata* does no credit to Soviet printing.

All whose business it is to try to understand the Indian problem have felt the need of a book which would give the background in an accessible form. They will therefore welcome *Renascent India* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) which covers the period from Ram Mohan Roy to Mohandas Gandhi. Its author, Dr. H. C. E. Zacharias, explains that he is by birth,

parentage, and education a Westerner, that he has spent a large part of his life in the East, and is of Jewish descent and Catholic faith; he therefore claims to be able to present an impartial history. He scarcely does that, for his partiality is plain: his great hero is Gokhalé; among English men, Ripon, Montagu, and Irwin are favourites, while he is less than fair to Morley. His summary, however, is valuable, and it leaves us wondering whether there has not come into play that "Nemesis of all alien rule: that it is always too late in its reforms".

A doctor and J.P., with wide experience, has written *Psychology in Court* (Williams & Norgate, 5s.), in which he argues that in Police and County Courts people are treated as types and cases, not as individuals, and that there is need for the presence of psychologists or trained observers. From juvenile cases, compensation cases, coal miners' nystagmus, *etc.*, the doctor shows how home circumstances, neuroses, *etc.*, furnish explanations of offences and situations otherwise mysterious.

Mr. Claud Mullins, a London Magistrate, has been moved by his experiences to write *Marriage, Children, and God* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.), a reasoned plea for the use of contraceptives. He has come to the conclusion that

> the churches are now called, not to pronounce on the advisability of contraception, but to decide whether it is not their duty to spread knowledge about it, to teach its necessity themselves and to do all that they can to guard against its abuse.

He offers a series of general principles (pp. 187-189) which furnish both an admirable summary and a basis for discussion. While hoping that

> all religion will throw its cloak over the deliberate limitation of families and will both accept and teach self-control and contraception together,

Mr. Mullins is by no means a blind advocate, nor does he believe that contraception is a cure for all sexual ills. He recognizes, too,

> that science has so far not worked out the possible reactions to contraception, namely, the effect upon the woman's physical and mental health and the effect (if any) upon children born subsequent to the use of contraception.

At times he goes beyond his brief, and expresses opinions too confidently there is by no means unanimity, as he seems to think, in the view that *coitus interruptus* "is psychologically harmful, especially to women, and thoroughly unreliable", nor does he discuss at all why this method should be more psychologically harmful than the use of mechanical means.

Dr. Marie Stopes is nothing if not persistent, and in *Roman Catholic Methods of Birth Control* (Davies, 6s.) she again joins issue with the Roman Catholic Church. She shows how there is no ground for the assumption that the Roman Catholic Church condemns all birth control, and examines the methods it allows.

> The unfortunate thing for Rome's arguments at present is . . . the indubitable scientific fact that her approved methods do not actually come up to her own definition of the standard requisite for her own approval.

The equivocal nature of much Roman Catholic propaganda is clearly shown, as well as the power of the Roman Catholic Church in the Irish Free State, in pressure on newspapers and on statesmen, national and international.

Woman's Periodicity (Douglas, 6s.), the work of Miss Mary Chadwick, a State Registered Nurse, may be found of value by women and by those who have to deal with growing girls. It is disappointing, however, in that, while it recognizes the emotional effects of physical events in woman's life, it does nothing to suggest how they may be directed and controlled.

Wasted Womanhood (Allen & Unwin, 6s.) consists of papers by the late Miss Charlotte Cowdroy, preceded by a biography of Miss Cowdroy by Miss Bennell, her pupil, colleague, and successor as Principal of the Crouch End College and High School. Miss Cowdroy overcame the handicap of an unhappy home-life, and did a remarkably successful work. Passing through a period of feminism she changed her views, and in the papers here printed shows herself outspoken to a degree. She is opposed to co-education, considers that the undue emphasis on athletics for girls has done great harm, and urges early marriage and motherhood. The great mistake in education has been in thinking women to be like men when they are essentially different, while the first plank in the "New Woman's Platform" ought to be "the absolute prohibition of all young married women from wage-earning occupations" (but surely it cannot be correct to assert that "80 per cent of women now earn their own living"). This volume calls for the attention of all interested in education and in the life and work of women. Sentences like these continually light up an argument:

> A woman has far more vitality than a man, and this vitality is given in trust for her children. It may be said that the man has the larger current account and the woman the larger deposit account in the Bank of Vitality. The fact that she can draw on this deposit account at a crisis explains why woman is a wonderful sprinter in all departments of life.

The sub-title of the Rev. Maldwyn Edwards's *John Wesley and the 18th Century* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.) is "A Study of his Social and Political Influence". While Mr. Edwards holds that

> John Wesley was too good a Tory in the government of his own Society not to be so in the government of his country,

he nevertheless considers him to be "the most influential person of his day". "Against him were the Mob, the Clergy, the Aristocracy, and the Press", and yet he transformed the spiritual nature of England, his influence overflowing into social and political channels. In a useful sketch Mr. Edwards outlines the extent and limitations of this achievement, dealing with subjects like the French and American Revolutions, Roman Catholic Relief, Slavery, and Education.

Dr. T. Ferrier Hulme's *Voices of the New Room* (Epworth Press, 1s. 6d.) contains lively, enthusiastic lectures delivered in Drew Seminary, U.S.A. They tell of Wesley and his early followers, with frequent reference to Bristol and to the "New Room" there that Dr. Hulme knows so well.

With Dr. Hulme's book should be read *The Dawn of American Methodism* (Epworth Press, 6s.) by another English Methodist minister, the Rev. Richard Pyke. Mr. Pyke aims at telling for English readers the story as it centres round the personalities of Wesley, Whitefield, Coke, and Asbury. He provides an Appendix which shows that, from the work of these pioneers, a Church has developed which has now over 64,000 churches with over 9,000,000 members.

Another volume of Drew Lectures is the Rev. F. Luke Wiseman's *Charles Wesley, Evangelist and Poet* (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.). No one could have been found more akin to the musician evangelist than the new President of the Conference. In graphic chapters he describes Charles's work as evangelist, preacher, "churchman and theologian", "mystic and seeker after God", and poet.

In this Centenary Year of the Oxford Movement, few people have not been reminded how in Tract 90 Newman endeavoured to show that the

Thirty-nine Articles were capable of a Roman interpretation. In *The Council of Trent and Anglican Formularies* (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.), the Rev. H. E. Symonds, of the Community of the Resurrection, investigates the dogmatic decisions of the Council with a view to discovering whether the Anglican Articles can be said to be in agreement with them. Such investigation is, of course, a necessary preliminary to any union between the Roman and Anglican churches, but, while the book's jacket may be justified in saying Mr. Symonds has done his work with care, its use of the word "detached" can scarcely be defended, for Mr. Symonds's views are very obvious throughout. His conclusion is that

> there are few, if any, irreconcilable differences between the conciliar definitions of Trent and the actual doctrinal formulas to which the English Church is committed.

There has always been danger lest the matchless music of Newman's prose should still the sense of criticism; sometimes it allures and fascinates and almost paralyses. Mr. J. Lewis May has caught something of his master's genius, and at the beginning of *The Unchanging Witness* (Centenary Press, 3s. 6d.) there is many an echo. But if the reader keeps alert and awake, Mr. May is even less convincing than Newman; often, indeed, he will rouse vigorous opposition. Who that has had to wade through some of the controversies of the Fathers will accept the view that it was Protestantism that brought a war of words into the Church? Is this paragraph itself anything but words and wind?

> When the Reformers set about their well-intentioned but disastrous task of improving what Time and God had wrought, they let loose, as from a cave of Æolus, a tempestuous plague of words that swept far and wide over the world, devouring the things that were old and beautiful, a plague that even now has not yet spent its force. Over one half of Europe they laid the Church in ruins. They shattered the ancient symbols and flung to the winds the accumulated treasures of the past. England did not escape. From the date the Pulpit reared itself aloft—*dira facies*—and the voice of the Preacher never grew weary.

Mr. May believes

> To discard that ritual, to modernize our formularies, to restate our creeds in the terminology of the science of the day, would be deliberately to divest ourselves of this precious and irreplaceable legacy of the past.

A church with "the Sacrament"

> somehow seems no longer tenantless. It seems, in fact, like home. The Light serves as a focus to one's meditations.

Mr. May embellishes these theories in his larger and very readable work, *The Oxford Movement, Its History and Its Future* (Bodley Head, 10s. 6d.). The Church is

> the Bride of Christ and the divinely ordained dispenser, through a duly ordained priesthood, of the Sacraments,

and the Oxford Movement was a

> fight for the restoration of those Sacramental ideas which had so long lain obscured and dormant, to restore to the Altar the sovereignty which had been usurped by the Pulpit, and to give back to the Visible Church its character as the Bride of Christ and the only channel of the covenanted grace of God.

About Newman Mr. May almost invariably becomes lyrical. He

> stands apart from them all, his spirit transfigured by some unearthly light, his sanctity glowing with ethereal fire.

He showed that

> a man can be at once a great gentleman, a great Englishman, and a great Catholic,

and we hear his

> voice lovely and forlorn, a voice apart and solitary, a voice that cannot die.

It is amusing to contrast such passages with Mr. May's laboured and conscientious efforts to be just to Manning. How unfair he can be is illustrated when he generalizes from a solitary instance, as when, speaking of remote villages, he writes,

> There a char-à-banc or two containing detachments of aggrieved Protestants can be brought in no time from a big town fifty miles off, and lay the Church waste in the twinkling of an eye, and then be off again to score another victory elsewhere.

Mr. Kenneth Ingram's readable study, *John Keble* (Allan, 6s.), does well to bring out the work Keble did as parish priest and poet; perhaps two quotations best describe his life—his own, "If the Church of England were to fail, it should be found in my parish", and the parishioner's remark twenty-four years after his death, "Father and I do read *The Christian Year* every Sunday, and it do bring him out to us more than we knew even when he was alive". Incidentally Mr. Ingram notes that the restoration "of the Catholic calendar has been one of the most valuable results of the Revival". He is not so safe in declaring without qualification that

> Nonconformity in England was definitely a class movement which protested against the supremacy of the Anglican Church and the country party.

The best part of Mr. Shane Leslie's *The Oxford Movement, 1833-1933* (Burns Oates, 5s.) is to be found in its 50 pp. of Appendixes—on the Movement's relation to Literature, Art, the Catholic Church in England, *etc.* Here we have facts not easy to find without much labour. The rest of the book is smart, and sometimes amusing, though often unreliable. Mr. Leslie believes that the three times the Anglican Church has moved out of slumber are (1) Under Laud and the Caroline Divines; (2) Under Sancroft and the Nonjurors; (3) Under Newman and the Tractarians. Shades of John Wesley!

Two useful additions to the Oxford Movement Centenary Series, both by Dr. F. L. Cross, are *The Tractarians and Roman Catholicism* and *The Oxford Movement and the Seventeenth Century* (S.P.C.K., 1s. 6d. each).

Ever since we read Seebohm's *Oxford Reformers* nearly 30 years ago we have thought of John Colet as one of the most attractive of English Churchmen, and we are glad to have our memories refreshed by Sir J. A. R. Marriott's *The Life of John Colet* (Methuen, 6s.). Sir John thinks that Colet has received less than his due from history because he was a liberal theologian and not a party man, one who followed the *via media,* and did not win the enthusiastic approval of Catholic or Protestant, Fundamentalist or Puritan. A readable sketch incorporates in the preface a fine testimony to Dr. R. F. Horton which all Congregationalists will rejoice to see.

We always find it difficult to understand why our shelves should have a long row of books about Luther and very few about Calvin. There was room for another study of the Genevan Reformer, although Williston Walker's biography in the "Heroes of the Reformation" series is extremely well done. Mr. R. N. Carew Hunt's *Calvin* (Centenary Press, 10s. 6d.) will not supersede it, though it is workmanlike and an admirable corrective to Doumergue. Mr. Carew Hunt writes dispassionately, but we cannot help feeling at times that his acquaintance with parts of his subject is only second-hand. He is especially good on Calvin's disciplinary work at Geneva, and perhaps weakest on the theology; but his sketch deserves careful reading.

In *Elizabeth, Queen of England* (Longmans, 12s. 6d.) Mr. Mil Waldman proves himself an advocate, even an impassioned advocate. T makes for good reading, though it can scarcely be said to make scient history; the state of England was not so utterly hopeless ("four mill frightened, distracted, wretched, sullen people") on Elizabeth's access as Mr. Waldman suggests, nor so established ("a mighty nation") at h death—or in 1588; apparently the last fifteen years of the Queen's life of no account, for Mr. Waldman stops abruptly with the Armada. Histo cannot be written in superlatives—we have "the shakiest throne in Europ and "the unhappiest legacy that ever fell to an English sovereign" consecutive lines; it ought to be possible to admire Elizabeth's statecra and to recognize all that she did for her country without depreciati Burghley, or glossing over the seamy side of her public and private li Mr. Waldman, too, is extremely confident, speaking with assurance abo the Queen's relationship with Leicester, though he slurs over the ear affair with Seymour. It is interesting, too, to note his criticism f Catherine de Medici, who was made on much the same lines as Elizabeth; the only difference was that Machiavellianism in the one case proved a failure, in the other a success.

But when all has been said, Mr. Waldman has produced a brisk an lively study which will hold any reader and will mislead none save tho unwary enough to forget that it is not the whole truth.

Francis Bacon has had much written about him down to Miss Stur recent book, but we never feel to know him as we feel to know some of h contemporaries, although he was

> attacked by Suffolk and patronized by Buckingham, libelled by Pope ("wis brightest, meanest of mankind") and rebuked by Macaulay, and pitied Dean Church.

Even after reading Mr. Charles Williams's able biography, *Bacon* (Bark 10s.) he remains inscrutable—he never reveals himself, or "gives hims away"; nevertheless, Mr. Williams presents a coherent picture of whose encyclopædic knowledge will ever be a marvel, whose insistence experiment and inference were of the utmost significance to science, a whose astonishing collapse before the charge of corruption still remains mystery. Although Bacon failed in his purpose, "the reorganization the whole of human thought", he probably did more in that direction th any individual before or since, and Mr. Williams skilfully works development of the Chancellor's plans to this end into the narrative of public life. There is an unhappy misprint on p. 85.

Readers are likely to be put off by Mr. Francis Watson's antics at beginning of his "Book about Rabelais", *Laughter for Pluto* (Lovat Di son, 12s. 6d.): he is for all the world like a child who has learnt a naugh word, and persists in saying it when he finds his elders think it shockin If this obstacle can be surmounted, it will be found that there is mu careful thinking in this exposition of Rabelais, all the more to the poi when Mr. Watson does not try to be Rabelaisian.

Mr. A. Neave Brayshaw combines the care and accuracy of the scientif historian with the power of making his material live. His *The Personality George Fox* (Allenson, 3s. 6d.—a remarkably low price) is no exceptio It gives readers a vivid account of the life and work of the founder Quakerism—an account both informing and reliable.

Mr. J. H. Evans's *Joseph Smith: An American Prophet* (Macmilla 21s.) would have benefited by compression: it is easy to use many wor in writing about the founder of the Latter Day Saints, even if one sets

"to give a scientific treatment . . . . to present the available facts, without smothering these facts in opinion". We do not know whether Mr. Evans is responsible for the page which precedes the Preface—a page of extravagant claims rather than a statement of facts—it says, *e.g.*, that the Book of Mormon "is to-day more widely read than any other volume save the Bible". To-day we endeavour to understand and explain "the Prophet" rather than denounce him; it is not easy to do so, for to say "an epileptic", "a mystic", "a psychic" does not get us much further. Nor does Mr. Evans, even though in a section headed "Joseph Smith An Exceptional Man" he tells us that Smith's case "is that of St. Paul's (*sic*) over again". The mystery of the engraved gold plates and the translation is not made any clearer to us; indeed the book as a whole, instead of answering questions, causes the reader to ask more.

Mr. Herbert Agar calls his *The American Presidents from Washington to Harding* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 10s. 6d.) "A Study in Democracy". He claims that while six of the first seven Presidents were men of great ability, only four of the remaining twenty-two were above the average of politicians, and he finds the explanation of this in the fact that under Andrew Jackson the government changed from an oligarchy into a democracy, and after the Civil War from a democracy into a plutocracy, culminating in the shameful episode of Harding. We remember getting into trouble in the United States in 1920 for suggesting that Harding and his opposite number in the election for the Presidency were no more than third-rate politicians: we should not have ventured to say one tenth of what Mr. Agar does! In his Preface he suggests that, while his survey ceases at Harding, there has been no subsequent improvement; evidence of this statement should have been furnished. Mr. Agar writes with vigour, and his book may be put in the class of good journalism.

Mrs. Stephen Hobhouse has almost succeeded in recovering and reproducing the stilted style of serious 18th century writing for her *Life of Christian Samuel Hahnemann* (Daniel, 7s. 6d.). This, and the fact that she pays a good deal of attention to background, has filled out the facts of Hahnemann's life and made a full-size biography. It is welcome, for comparatively little is known of the founder of homœopathy, and of his struggles before it was admitted that it was possibly true that *similia similibus curantur,* that

> the same substance which, in large doses will prove lethal, and in smaller doses inhibitive, will, in minimal doses, prove stimulative to the same cells.

Mr. E. F. Benson calls his *Edward VII* (Longmans, 15s.) "An Appreciation", which is in itself suggestive; as we read we feel that the scales are weighted, and that Mr. Benson is something other than the scientific historian. Not that sympathetic biography is to be despised in these days when biography has gone to the other extreme; indeed, it is good to see Mr. Benson take up the cudgels for one whose defects were so obvious as Edward's. Nevertheless, most readers, if they are like ourselves, will feel that to Mr. Benson the Kaiser is very much of a "King Charles's head", and as soon as he is mentioned Mr. Benson's temperature goes up. In the antipathy between uncle and nephew Mr. Benson finds the secret of much of the European misunderstandings of the time, and on the whole we cannot but think that he over-rates both Edward's gifts as a diplomatist and the extent of his power and achievements. This may be admitted while acknowledging the King's great tact and social prowess. The best part of the book is that dealing with Edward's youth and education. The ludicrous mistakes made by Albert and Victoria in training their boy are placarded for all time as a warning to parents.

Altogether Mr. Benson gives us a very readable presentation of a thesis which cannot, we think, be sustained.

A more accurate verdict is that of Dr. G. P. Gooch, in the introductory chapter to *Edwardian England* (Benn, 10s. 6d.):

> No British sovereign since Elizabeth paid so many visits to the great country houses, and none was more assiduous at the race-course. Pleasure hunting, however, no longer interfered with the conscientious discharge of his duties. Every move in the diplomatic game was followed with eager interest, and his Continental journeys assumed a new political significance. The belief, still widely held abroad, that he fashioned British policy is a legend; but he was by no means a butterfly on the wheel. He read the more important dispatches with care, and his knowledge of the men who were making history all over the world surpassed that of any of his ministers.

Edward's reign was as much too short to have definite trends as his mother's was too long, but ten scholars have in these lectures endeavoured to discover developments which can be labelled "Edwardian". The lectures on "Literature" (Prof. Abercrombie), "Science" (Prof. H. Levy) and "Political Ideas" (Mr. C. H. Driver) are the best of the bunch, if we except Prof. A. P. Newton's short sketch, "The Empire". Dean Matthews's "Religion" is disappointing, while there is much overlapping in Dr. Gooch's survey, Mr. E. G. Hawke's "Domestic Politics", Prof. Seton Watson's "Foreign Relations" and the Editor's (Prof. Hearnshaw) "Edward VII", which is characteristically vigorous. Rarely can proofs have been so carelessly read.

The Social and Political Ideas of Some Representative Thinkers of the Victorian Age (Harrap, 8s. 6d.) is the eighth and final volume of the lectures delivered at King's College, London. Dr. G. P. Gooch opens with "The Victorian Age, 1837-1901", and there follow "Thomas Carlyle" (Mr. R. S. Dower), "Herbert Spencer" (Prof. Hearnshaw), "Sir Henry Maine" (Prof. de Montmorency), "Alexis de Tocqueville (Prof. Laski), "Karl Marx" (Mr. J. L. Gray—long and heavy), "T. H. Green" (Dr. A. D. Lindsay), "Matthew Arnold" (Prof. J. Dover Wilson—also long, but with a lighter touch), "Walter Bagehot" (Mr. C. H. Driver, with an Appendix on "The Development of a Psychological Approach to Politics in English Speculation before 1869"), and "Taine" (Mr. R. A. Jones). Prof. Dover Wilson is scarcely fair to Lord Hewart, with whom he breaks a lance about the "new despotism".

Idols and Invalids (Methuen, 6s.), the work of Dr. James Kemble, a medical man, may be said to be informing although far from edifying. The "idols" are Byron, Columbus, Judge Jeffreys, Louis XV, Cleopatra, Nelson, Henry VIII, and Queen Anne. We learn about Byron's lameness, the syphilis Columbus brought to Europe and which affected Henry VIII, the nature of Nelson's illnesses, and the pregnancies of Queen Anne. Jeffreys is whitewashed, his brutality and violence being attributed to the agony caused by the stone.

The Rev. N. G. Dunning's *Samuel Chadwick* (Hodder, 5s.) tells the inspiring story of the poor Burnley boy who went to work at 8 and who became President of the Methodist Conference and Head of Cliff College. No one can read it without being stirred to admiration, though their appreciation of Chadwick's life and work will perhaps be more restrained and discriminating than that of Mr. Dunning, who is a frank hero-worshipper. The faith and fire of the hero are well brought out, but we think many readers would have been glad of more information about him. Had he any children, did he *never* play or watch a game, what were his

hobbies?—these things we should like to know as well as what he did for the College and for *Joyful News;* except for a few words in the Prologue we learn little of this side of Chadwick's life. Mr. Lloyd George, in a foreword, speaks of Chadwick's "consummate mastery of the speaker's art" and his "great gift of friendship".

The Rev. W. H. Lax's *Adventure in Poplar* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.) is the third volume in which the lively and energetic Methodist minister tells stories of his work in the crowded East End of London. Sometimes the sentiment is overdone, and sometimes the stories are chestnuts, but there is a passion for souls and an enthusiasm for serving men that would excuse greater blemishes than these.

Charles Henry Vine of Ilford (Allenson, 2s. 6d.) is an able, if filial, short biography by the Rev. Eric C. H. Vine of one whose remarkable ministry will long be remembered in Ilford.

In his *Autobiographica* (Blackwell, 3s.) Professor Percy Gardner gives us glimpses into his life and work which are as revealing as they are delightful. Not least interesting to one reader was the information that Gardner's parents belonged to the church in Hackney which is now Clapton Park Congregational church. Gardner himself became a member of the Church of England, and one of the threads of this book is that which shows the development of his thought until he became one of the most active members of the Modern Churchmen's Union. All students of numismatology, archæology, and theology will do well to read these fascinating pages from the pen of an octogenarian.

The Book of the Hibbert Trust, printed for private circulation, reprints the Memoirs of Robert Hibbert and the History of the Trust written by the Rev. J. Mutch in 1874, and Dr. W. H. Drummond next takes up the story and summarizes the activities of the Trust down to the present.

What we have read of Goethe's 150 volumes has always left us cold, and we hoped that *The Practical Wisdom of Goethe* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.) would help us to understand something of his genius. It is the translation of an anthology selected by Herr Emil Ludwig, published in German in 1931. Herr Ludwig says that while it contains "only one-third of Goethe's wisdom", omitting his writings on Nature and Art, it is, nevertheless, the result of prolonged and thorough search, and "fitted to be a Vade-mecum, a Guide to the Art of Life". Goethe, he holds, "is the German who can teach us most for our life from day to day", and he has therefore arranged under 24 sections these extracts from his prose and poetry. We remain not the least bit attracted.

He is a bold man who attempts to follow where Bunyan laid a trail, especially if he go so far as to challenge comparison by labelling his effort *The Pilgrim's Regress* (Dent, 5s.), as Mr. C. S. Lewis has done. We fear that while the writer of this "Allegorical Apology for Christianity, Reason, and Romanticism" can be congratulated on his courage, this must be almost the limit of our praise, for, although there are clever things in this search for an island, it scarcely succeeds either in gripping the attention or as an allegory. Bunyan still remains in lonely grandeur.

Students of English literature will find Prof. B. Ifor Evans's *English Poetry in the Later Nineteenth Century* (Methuen, 10s. 6d.) extremely useful, perhaps especially so the chapters which deal with the minor poets. Prof. Evans has ruled out all living poets, and Tennyson and Browning; he gives to Matthew Arnold an important place in the transition from the Tennyson-Browning period to that which followed it, and we are inclined

to think allots a disproportionate space to John Davidson. The chap on "Robert Bridges and his Associates" is extremely good, and the wo with its admirable index, will serve as a valuable book of reference. Th is a misprint on p. 237.

Prof. Evans requires nearly 400 pp. for his fifty years of English lit ature; Mr. Burton Rascoe only needs 600 pp. for *Titans of Literatu* (Routledge, 12s. 6d.), the titans being selected from all over the world fr the time of Homer to Proust and George Moore. But Mr. Rascoe, so t jacket tells us, is "alert and alive, witty and intelligent, shrewd and spo taneous", and so he has written a book "like no other on the subject so f published", which "probably no other living critic would have dared write". This is probably true, and it is just as likely that no reader— perhaps we had better say no British reader—will live to read the bo through. This boisterousness which claims to be absence of pedantr this familiarity and clap-you-on-the-back style, becomes tiring after mu less than 600 pp. But perhaps it will be sufficient to quote the first par graph in "Milton the Conscience":

> Take an aspirin and a bromide before I utter the most frightful blasphem that was ever uttered since Dr. Faustus signed his name to an infamo pact with the Devil, a pact which released him from the great urgency f following theological disputations to their ultimate, infinite end and gave hi permission, almost too late, to go out and chuck a girl under the chin. I a about to say (please hold your breath) that *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise R gained* are horrible examples of what may occur when a man with displeasing type of mind happens to be an expert versifying technician what is loosely called the biblical style.

Mr. B. E. L. Davis, the author of *Edmund Spenser* (Cambridge Pre 12s. 6d.) plunges into his "critical study" right away, making no conc sions to his readers, but assuming their familiarity with the works of whom Lamb aptly labelled "the Poet's Poet". He conceives Spenser individual as

> largely eclipsed by Spenser the representative apostle of that Engl Renaissance which revealed itself, under different aspects, in geographi discovery, religious reformation, and the revival of learning,

his Christianity being overlaid by the Renaissance's paganism.

One of the best of Mr. Davis's chapters is that entitled "Romanc especially in its examination of Spenser's sources. Thorough and illum ating discussions of Allegory, Diction, and Imagery follow, while the c cluding chapter—perhaps the weakest in the book—deals with "Phi sophical Ideas". We wonder if Mr. Davis has made enough of Spens religion and his relationship to the controversies of his time. His sinc and obvious sympathy with Grindal, "good Algrind, whose hap was il suggests, we are inclined to think, an interest which may have been de and probably explanatory of much in Spenser's life. That apart, M Davis has given us a fine piece of work.

Mr. B. M. Jones's *Henry Fielding, Novelist and Magistrate* (Allen Unwin, 8s. 6d.) is a competent study, as fascinating as it is well-informe of a kind it does one good to meet. It is in large measure an expositi of the dictum that the only two English writers who ever touch the la without showing their ignorance of it are Shakespeare and Fielding. M Jones, however, not merely discusses the legal allusions in Fielding's pla and novels, but goes on to show how he lifted the degraded office of B Street magistrate to a position of usefulness and importance, established t first detective force in the country, and made suggestions for legislati and administration which had profound social consequences.

We wonder if it is a mere coincidence that the initials of Arthur Collier, "whose very name I hate", are those at the foot of the letter attacking Fielding in *Old England*. Possibly Mr. Jones knows definitely whether "A.C." is "Argus Centoculi", and whether the two are identical with Collier, who would then be another lawyer-journalist.

Mr. H. I'Anson Fausset has followed his *Samuel Taylor Coleridge* by *The Lost Leader* (Cape, 12s. 6d.), a very fine study of Wordsworth, which is really a commentary on Blake's verdict:

> I see in Wordsworth the natural man rising up against the spiritual man continually, and then he is no poet, but a heathen philosopher, at enmity with all true poetry and inspiration.

Mr. Fausset asks why Wordsworth went wrong, not merely with Annette, but in such a way that from the age of 37 there was an abrupt decline in his creative faculty; he discusses what brought him to such a pass that his "poetic instinct was stultified by a self-defensive and self-deceiving morality", and life

> ceased to inform his views, as they hardened into the fixed dogmas and prejudices which he donned as an armour against the radical tendencies in his age and the disintegrating tendencies in himself.

Mr. Fausset, in working out the effect on Wordsworth's work of his gradual preferment of security to reality, makes many fresh and fruitful observations. Take, for example, this comment on the naturalistic creed which buoyed up the poet for some years:

> Unfortunately he translated his satisfaction into a doctrine, which was so seductively near a true one as to be the more misleading. From Rousseau to D. H. Lawrence men stricken with the disease of thought have striven to cure themselves, as Wordsworth did here. And always they have failed because they have chosen a descent into the primitive instead of an ascent into real enlightenment.

We wonder how many books on Ruskin have been written during the last decade. The vogue of psycho-analysis has focused attention on one of the most striking—and most pathetic—figures of the Victorian age. Mr. R. H. Wilenski describes his *John Ruskin* (Faber, 15s.) as "An Introduction to Further Study of His Life and Work". Having studied Ruskin's life and pondered his writings, he believes he has found the key to the problem they present in the fact that Ruskin "was not only a great man and a genius, but also a mental invalid all his life", being a sufferer from manic-depression. This accounts for all Ruskin's vagaries, his alternating high spirits and deep gloom, his preaching and his self-indulgence, his grandiose schemes and "mobility of interest", his love affairs and his final breakdown. The Synoptic Tables prefixed, in which we see at a glance the events in Ruskin's life, his publications, his repute, and the state of his health present an admirable summary of the thesis expounded in Part I of the book. Part II is "Critical", discussing Ruskin as art critic and social and political economist, and devoting special chapters to his religion and his style. In an Appendix Mr. Wilenski argues that the view that Ruskin was already accepted as an authority on art in the fifties is altogether mistaken.

Few families can have washed their dirty linen so publicly as the Tolstoys, and it is to be hoped that with the publication of Countess Alexandra Tolstoy's *The Tragedy of Tolstoy* (Allen & Unwin, 15s.) the process will have ended, though we doubt it. The Countess acted as her father's secretary, and took his side in the long family dispute. Here she describes the life at Yasnaia Poliana when she was a child and subsequently, and allows us to see the conditions under which Tolstoy worked.

She then tells of the growth of her mother's pathological condition, an the way in which the poor woman constantly resisted her husband's plan and purposes. The story of how her constant tormenting and her decisio to baffle his testamentary depositions about his books drove him to leav home is well known, but here it is graphically told by the one with the mos intimate knowledge. The writer's devotion to her father is the most con spicuous feature of the story, though once more we feel how impossible i is for an Anglo-Saxon to understand the Russian character.

Mr. Thornton Wilder appears in the role of translator in *Lucrece* (Longmans, 6s.), in which he renders André Obey's drama, *Le Viol de Lucrèce,* in a style well suited to the story.

It is scarcely likely that the outcry which greeted the publication of the Browning love-letters will find any echo from readers of two volumes of love-letters recently issued, *Letters of Courtship between John Torr and Maria Jackson, 1838-43* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.), and *The Love-Letters of Walter Bagehot and Eliza Wilson* (Faber, 10s. 6d.). Neither correspondence contains much that is of historical importance: the writers, all of whom could write a good letter, were too much concerned with each other to make much reference to current events. They are of value, however, in conveying the atmosphere of their day, and revealing how young women of the early Victorian period fell in love. They show, too, that lovers are much the same in every age and class: there are the same anxieties and yearnings, the same misunderstandings and explanations. One of Miss Wilson's letters says that Charlotte Brontë's over-sentimental women made her "feel quite savage". Bagehot's scepticism about a "rubber" (apparently what is called a masseur to-day) is outspoken and refreshing there are unqualified practitioners even yet who claim, as did this Edinburgh exponent, that "rubbing" cures all manner of diseases.

The artist, be he painter, composer, or writer, is constrained t borrow: he cannot divorce himself entirely from tradition. At times h borrows consciously, at others unconsciously. The difference betwee imaginative and unimaginative borrowing marks the difference betwee the artist and the plagiarist; "the plagiarist is simply the bad borrower" Such is the thesis which Mr. W. A. Edwards works out in a learned essay *Plagiarism* (Heffer, 3s. 6d.).

A more readable book, dealing with much the same subject, is Mr E. E. Kellett's *Literary Quotation and Allusion* (Heffer, 3s. 6d.). Althoug few can compete with Mr. Kellett either in the range of his learning o the freshness with which he invariably writes, many will enjoy this study Indeed, we can imagine few little books which would do more good to th youthful literary aspirant; while "intriguing" him it would remind hin both of the vast heritage on which he can enter if he will, and the high calling to which he is called.

Whether we read Dr. George Jackson in the *Manchester Guardian* or in the *Methodist Recorder,* we always find his articles both racy and informing. Those now collected in *Half-hours in a Library* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.) are no exception, though we do wish he would not speak about the "National Dictionary of Biography". Of these papers, we enjoyed most "Books I can reach without rising", "Good, but not for the Prayer Meeting", "A caution to Critics" and those on James Woodforde and A. B. Bruce. We welcomed, too, the articles on comparatively little known people like William Cory and E. B. Cowell. We are happy to agree with Dr. Jackson in the place he gives to Mark Rutherford, though we scarcely share his view of Wordsworth.

Mr. J. H. McNulty's quick wit and ready pen are seen to advantage in *Concerning Dickens and Other Literary Characters* (Author, 22 Kenninghall Road, E. 5, 1s. 6d.), many of the papers in which have appeared in *The Dickensian* and *The Old Lady of Threadneedle Street.* There are some excellent parodies and *jeux d'esprit.*

In *Five Novelist Poets of To-day* (Joiner & Steele, 7s. 6d.) Mr. R. L. Mégroz argues that modern poets are doing for the novel what poets did for the theatre in Shakespeare's day. The five whose work he analyses are Walter de la Mare (called *Water* on p. 59—there are also misprints on pp. 99 and 224), L. A. G. Strong, Martin Armstrong, Osbert Sitwell, and D. H. Lawrence, who a hundred years hence will be regarded "as one of the greatest literary creators of our time"! Useful lists of first editions are provided.

With painful steps and slow we attempt to follow those who are expounding modern science for the vulgar. At times we can relate passages in Sir James Jeans's *The New Background of Science* (Cambridge Press, 7s. 6d.) to previously acquired knowledge, but often his terminology is so unfamiliar that we are bewildered. We take heart, however, as we read that the average physicist of today

> has formed a far better picture of four-dimensional space and of tensors of the second rank than his predecessors of a generation ago.

We already begin to see daylight through the Michelson-Morley Experiment, though the Lorentz Transformation remains out of our reach; perhaps in a generation we may be able to comprehend the theory of relativity, Heisenberg's relation, Planck, and the rest. Meanwhile we can only thank Sir James Jeans for doing his best, and ask him to be patient. His illustrations invariably help us, while we are encouraged by his view that

> the final direction of change will probably be away from the materialism and strict determinism which characterized 19th century physics, towards something which will accord better with our everyday experience.

In *Let's Start Over Again* (Allen & Unwin, 4s. 6d.) Mr. Vash Young gives us another dose of the uplift-medicine he administered in *A Fortune to Share.* He is an apostle of optimism, cheerfulness, and effort, and both in the business and the moral sphere his words should serve as a tonic in these days of depression.

Mr. A. L. Boydon's experience in the Inland Revenue was mainly with clergy of the Church of England, but all ministers will find his *Income Tax for the Clergy* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 3s. 6d.) useful.

EDITOR.

Since Cowley's death Dr. Moses Gaster remains as the outstanding interpreter of the Samaritans, to whom he has devoted many years of close attention, based on personal intercourse with the leaders of the surviving Samaritan community, and on the documents with which they have supplied him. His *Samaritan Eschatology* (Search Co., 12s. 6d.) consists of selections from this hitherto unpublished material, and of discussions of their significance. It deals with the Samaritan ideas about death and what lies beyond it, the Day of Judgment, and the Taheb, the Samaritan equivalent of the Jewish Messiah (though Dr. Gaster brings out important differences). The least convincing part of his exposition is the argument by which he seeks to establish the early date of the oral tradition on these and the other subjects which he discusses; his manuscript material is, of course, very much later. Apart from this important point, there is much in the volume to interest the student of the *Apocrypha* and the *Pseudepigrapha,* and

indeed of the *New Testament*. The book is another proof of what we s in Judaism and in Islam and in Christianity itself—that, so far as religion is based on a book, it is compelled to develop an "oral tradition" of some kind, to accompany the letter of the law, and to adjust it to n circumstances and ideas.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

Principal Alexander Martin calls *The Finality of Jesus for Fa* (Clarke, 5s.) "an Apologetic Essay". It contains the substance of h Cunningham Lectures and is a very cautious enforcement of the the that Jesus Christ is central to Christianity. Dr. Martin begins by discus ing the relation of historic relativity to Christian faith, and concludes th there is no reason why we should not believe that

> at one point in history a worth has appeared, an acquaintance with the ult mately real has been attained, a good achieved and made available, whic leaves nothing more for the spiritual craving of man to desire.

He then turns to history and discusses various presentations of Jesu Christ in the *N.T.* as Rabbi, as Messiah, as sinless, and as saviour an judge. Dr. Martin's treatment of the subject is nothing if not scholarl He knows all that has been written upon it, and he is perhaps too read to make concessions to radicalism. But in the long run his main conten tion emerges practically unscathed, namely, that Jesus Christ is and h the right to be supreme in the spiritual order, the guide, the saviour, an the judge of men.

Prof. H. P. Van Dusen, of Union Seminary, New York, is well know to many friends both in Edinburgh and Oxford. He belongs to a young generation of American theologians in which there are several men great promise, and no man is better fitted than he to re-interpret Christia ity to the modern generation. This is the task which he attempts in *T Plain Man Seeks for God* (Scribners, 8s. 6d.). His diagnosis of the mode situation is shrewd and searching, though naturally rather more true America than of this country, and his advocacy of a reasoned theism as t necessary half-way house to the Christian revelation is well thought o and altogether sane. Mr. Van Dusen's main contention is that religion not merely an "elective in the university of life" but man's essential a paramount interest, as God is "the first and most living and most cert of realities". In maintaining this position he contends that we must g much further than modern liberal theology would carry us. The inevita goal of such philosophy is a thin humanism which can never really m man's most pressing needs. Only a living faith in a living and active G can at once solve for the modern man the riddle of his universe and of him a way of life which will satisfy his highest aspirations. As Mr. V Dusen says, what marks off the religious from the secular life is its fai and

> confidence in insights believed to be true but never wholly proven true to launch forth upon a pathway never fully seen in devotion to goals be lieved to be attainable but never completely achieved.

This is a really timely and useful contribution to the best type of religious apologetic and should be widely read by ministers and other teachers o youth.

Everyone is interested in fairy tales and folklore, and everyone realize that they have played their part in the development of human thought an human history. But a good many people feel also that they have suffere unduly at the hands of "glum researchers", and that in the processes analysis, discussion, and comparison they are often broken like butterflie

on the wheel. Dr. W. R. Halliday is fully aware of this danger, and in his lectures on *Indo-European Folk Tales and Greek Legend* (Cambridge Press, 7s. 6d.) supplies a study of folklore and legend that is as free from pedantry as it is full of fascination. After a brief discussion of the relation between myth, fairy tale, and legend, he deals with the problem of the diffusion of Indo-European folk tales and their early correspondence with Greek legend, and in the last three chapters illustrates his main points very fully from the familiar stories of Procne and Philomela, Perseus the Gorgon-slayer, and the Goat and the Vine. While a good deal of Dr. Halliday's work is written mainly for specialists in the subject, his book is entirely readable and should appeal to anyone who has any interest in the hinterland of literature. It contains many "startling detections of hidden resemblances" and shows how curiously the human mind in widely different parts of the earth works out to the same conclusions under the same influences and conditions.

W. B. Selbie.

Mr. James Morgan, writer of *The Psychological Teaching of St. Augustine* (Stock, 7s. 6d.) admits in the Preface that "he has no special qualifications for undertaking such an important subject". We are compelled to agree with him. As an example of his English style we may reproduce a passage from Augustine's *Confessions* (VII. 21) given as a quotation but actually a paraphrase,

> "I have undertaken, O my God", says Augustine, "to read with eagerness Your Sacred Writings. . . I have found it in Your Scriptures, with the help of Thy Grace".

To illustrate his knowledge of philosophy there is the remark that "the later followers of Plato desired to be called neither Academics nor Peripatetics", which is not surprising since the Peripatetics were followers of Aristotle. For unconscious humour there are the two *obiter dicta,* that Augustine "refers to the most illustrious persons of antiquity, both sacred and profane", and that "though we are compelled to recognize the influence of Greek philosophy" on Augustine, he "at times starts off on an independent line of thought which is quite original, derived from an entirely different source" (p. 36).

John Murphy.

The Rev. J. S. Stewart's *The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) is one of a series for Bible Class use published by the Church of Scotland. It is an excellent book for that purpose, and covers the ground in chapters on such subjects as "The Gospel of the Kingdom", "The Ministry of Healing", "The Royal Law of Love". Each chapter is carefully annotated, and has prefixed to it a lectionary which should be very useful. Bible class leaders will find this book a reliable outline.

Dr. Michael Kaye's *Human Welfare* (Williams & Norgate, 6s.) is a discussion of social matters from a view which is chiefly ethical and educational. Apparently, in Dr. Kaye's altruistic state, there will be perfect democracy, and every man will have an assured income whether he works for it or not. The book also considers such important questions as Vocation, Leisure, Freedom, *etc.*

Sir Francis Younghusband's *The Living Universe* (Murray, 10s. 6d.) is, in its result, a spiritual interpretation of the Universe. One is glad to see this explorer putting forward his plea that life and love, the movement in all things of the Cosmic Spirit, ultimately rule the Universe; and not that much over-worked second law of thermo-dynamics. The greatest thing the Universe has produced is the Mystic. Greater than *homo sapiens*

is *homo mysticus;* and he will be found on many a planet of many a si as well as on our own earth—Sir Francis will have nothing to do wit "mechanistic" Universe. To the kind of scientist who thinks he reduce all things to temperature, this book will make little appeal: but the man who has seen visions in Nature, and has dreamt dreams, there much in it that will be very interesting. As a plea for the spiritual und standing of the whole mystery which we cover up under the word "evo tion", the book is worth a careful reading, and it is full of suggest thought; but again and again we wondered why Sir Francis did not "le the ditch", and instead of so much about the holiness of the Cosmic Spir speak of God. This is an earnest and attractive book.

Mr. Whately Carington's *The Death of Materialism* (Allen & Unwi 10s.) is an unusually clear discussion of the relation of matter consciousness and it aims at defining a view of consciousne which shall give a satisfactory account of all the facts of the Univers including those which are the main interest of Psychical Research. An kind of philosophical materialism Mr. Carington destroys outright, an scatters its ashes to the four winds—the material world is insubstantia and all we have are "modulations of consciousness", expressions in i dividual shape of a universal consciousness in which everything has i being, and apparently is finally subsumed; so that at last "God is all in all" though it is not made plain in what exact sense this universal conscious ness can be said to be *in loco Dei.* For its scientific-philosophical bac ground the book rests perhaps too much on Sir Arthur Eddington's *Natu of the Physical World;* but the whole treatment of the subject is full of li It is genuine work right through; and if the dragon is not really as de as the author thinks, it certainly ought to be after such a merry a intellectual onslaught. A thoroughly enjoyable book.

A. T. S. James.

The Bad Abbot of Evesham and other Mediaeval Studies, by Mr. H. Palmer (Blackwell, 4s. 6d.) contains recent articles reprinted fr magazines. The cruel despotism of Abbot Norreys over the Evesh monks is admirably portrayed, and there is a description of a bitter qua between the Abbey of St. Albans and the townsmen. The papers telli of the Jews in England and of the rules and results of taking Sanctu have interest, but the most penetrating study is about Bishop Pecock Chichester. The essays are slight, unannotated, and of a mildly popul nature, but one feels that the author has a thorough knowledge of documents and possesses that serenity—sympathy and detachment combi —which historical study demands.

Geoffrey F. Nuttall.

NEW EDITIONS, REPRINTS, *ETC.*

J. C. Brown. *The Oxford Group Movement. Is it of God or of Satan?* Pickering. 1s. 4th ed. revis and enlarged.
J. A. Hadfield. *The Psychology of Power.* Macmillan. 1s. Reprinted from *Adventure.*
J. Alick Bouquet. *A People's Book of Saints.* Longmans. 3s. 6d. Now reissued in The Swan Libra
G. H. Knight. *In the Secret of His Presence.* Pickering. 3s. 6d. 3rd impression. 2nd edition.
Naomi Richardson. *Barbarian Stories.* Cape. 5s. 1st published 1929.
Lord David Cecil. *The Stricken Deer.* Constable. 5s. 1st published 1929. Now issued in The Crow Series.
J. W. Clark. *Indigenous Fruits. World Dominion* Press. 6d. Reprinted from *World Dominion.*
J. McCabe. *The Popes and Their Church.* Watts. 2s. 6d. 3rd ed. further revised.
T. Whittaker. *The Origins of Christianity.* Watts. 7s. 6d. Fourth and definitive edition.
William Williams. *Charles Haddon Spurgeon.* R.T.S. 2s. and 1s. Revised and edited by his daughter Marguerite Williams.

ALSO RECEIVED.

W. E. Vine. *Christ's Eternal Sonship.* Pickering. 1s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.
Robert Lee. *The Outlined Galatians.* Pickering. 3s.
J. M. Macdougall Ferguson. *The Treasure Seekers.* N.S.S.U. 2s. Parables Retold for Children.
A. Wellesley Orr. *Who is Sylvia?* 1s. J. De Black. *Will God Speak?* 6d. Lutterworth Press.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

London Quarterly and Holborn Review (July). Congregationalists are given the place of honour in this Methodist journal, Dr. C. J. Cadoux opening with "Dr. B. W. Bacon's Views on Gospel Origins", and Mr. B. L. Manning following with "Hymns for the Use of the People called Methodists". The Editor discusses Dr. Orchard's autobiography, the Rev. L. S. Peake writes on "The Nature Teaching of Victorian Poets", and Mr. R. A. M. Dixon on "Joseph Priestley". There is an interesting "Study of Anti-Semitism: Past and Present" by Dr. A. Marmorstein.

The Hibbert Journal (July). The Rev. W. Watkin Davies writes on "Justice in International Affairs", and Mr. Ronald Symond on "Justice in the Teaching of Jesus". Father D'Arcy, Dr. F. L. Cross, and Dr. Gow discuss Dr. Orchard from the Jesuit, the Anglo-Catholic, and the Unitarian angles. There is a challenging article by Prof. G. C. Chatterji on "Are the Christian Values Final? " and a very readable contribution, "Romanticism in Religious Revivals", by Dr. A. W. Harrison. Dr. Moffatt surveys Theological Literature.

Baptist Quarterly (July). Dr. Dakin writes on "The Spurgeon Centenary", the Rev. William Olney on "Preaching and the Preacher", Mr. W. S. Stroud, of Westbourne Park, on "John Clifford", and the Rev. H. J. Flowers on "The Humour of the Book of Proverbs". The Financial Statement shows that the Baptist Historical Society had a much larger income than the corresponding Society in Congregationalism.

The Church Quarterly Review (July). The Bishop of Oxford has an important article on "What the Church as a Whole owes to the Oxford Movement", and Miss Irene Shipton writes on "Christina Rossetti : the Poetess of the Oxford Movement". Canon Oesterley surveys recent literature on *Ezekiel,* and two interesting historical articles are Canon Maynard Smith's "The Will of Henry VII", and Mr. G. Hjort's "Theological Schools in Medieval England". Mr. Frederick Hood has a discriminating estimate of the Group Movement, and Mr. E. F. F. Bishop's "Currents of Thought in Muslim Lands" should not be overlooked.

The Modern Churchman (June-July). No doubt in preparation for the next number, which will be devoted entirely to the Report of the Conference, the July number is occupied by book reviews. Prefixed to them is an article by Mr. Cecil Palmer entitled "A Publisher on the demand for Religious Books"—interesting enough, but surprising in that a publisher passes so many slips.

The Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Seventh Month). John A. Hughes opens with a paper on "The Eternal Spring", and Dr. H. J. Cadbury writes on "Colonial Quaker Antecedents to British Abolition of Slavery". Dr. Austin Priestman discusses "The Poetry of Francis Thompson", and Dr. Karl Seipp "John Bellers and the Idea of a League of Nations". Among other contributors are Agnes Fry, Frederick J. Gillman, R. J. Davidson, and E. E. Taylor.

Expository Times (July-Sept.). Two articles, by Dr. C. J. Wright and Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, deal with the question of "Authority in Religion." Dr. Garvie writes on "Grace and Order", and Prof. Dodd on "Miracles in the Gospels". In "The Message of the Epistles", Mr. H. G. Wood deals with *Gal.,* Dr. T. W. Manson with *I Cor.,* and Dr. James Reid with *II Cor.*

Social Service Review (June-Aug.). Miss Norah March tells "The History of the Infant Welfare Movement", and Mr. S. Myers and Miss E. G. B. Thomas describe "The Work of L.C.C. Evening Institutes and the Unemployed".

The Common Room (June). This number consists, in the main, of discussions of pertinent books, holiday articles, and a paper on "Unemployment and the Drama", by Mr. W. D. Wills.

British Journal of Inebriety (July). The paper in this issue is Dr. E. W. Adams's "Some Unusual Forms of Drug Addiction".

Individual Psychology and Psychosomatic Disorders (II) (Individual Psychol Pamphlets, No. 9). There are important papers by Dr. J. S. Fairbairn ("R marks on Psychology in Gynæcological Practice"), Mr. W. McAdam Ecc ("The Psychological Surroundings of the Surgical Patient"), Dr. Mary B Ferguson ("A Case of Aphonia"), and Dr. F. G. Crookshank ("Individu Psychology and Ill Health"). An important list of books on Individual Psych logy is added.

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (July). Prof. C. H. Dodd has be appointed to succeed Dr. Robert Mackintosh on the Council of the Librar The papers in this number are Prof. Alexander's "Value", the Earl of Cra ford and Balcarres's "Instruments and Discipline of Learning", Dr. H. Fleure's "Racial Distribution in the Light of Archæology", Dr. E. F. Jacob *"Florida Verborum Venustas:* Some Early Examples of Euphuism in England" and Mr. H. G. Richardson and Dr. G. O. Sayles's "The Provisions of Oxford" A facsimile is given of a manuscript of *The Miller's Tale* in the Library, an Dr. Tyson's "Hand-list of Charters" is continued.

The International Review of Missions (July). Lord Noel-Buxton writes a article on "A Century of Emanicipation". Dr. Garvie discusses "The Evan gelical Faith and Other Religions", and Dr. O. von Harling "Missions to Jews" Dr. J. H. Oldham continues his study of Brunner, the Rev. J. F. Edwards write on "Birth-Pangs of a New Era in India", and Miss Earthy on "An African Trib in Transition from Paganism to Christianity". Dr. A. D. Lindsay's "Exten sion and Research" expounds the recommendations of the Commission on Highe Christian Education in India.

World Dominion (July). From Japan come the Rev. W. H. Murray Walton "Christianity and Public Life in Japan", and a poem by Kagawa. From Chi Sir Montagu Beauchamp's "Strong Undercurrents in China", the Rev. Alexand McLeish's "The Vast Unfinished Task in China", and Dr. R. J. McCandlis "Anti-toxin in Anhwei". Other articles deal with Marseilles, Spain, Mala Amazonia, and Egypt.

The Evangelical Quarterly (July). Prof. Stoker continues his study of Fre Dr. W. Bell Dawson writes on "Miracles and the Laws of Nature", Dr. E. Thurston on "Early Races of Mankind", Dr. Pieters on "Science and the Bible and Dr. W. C. Robinson on "Jesus Christ is Jehovah".

The Yale Review (Summer). Several articles deal with American and int national politics ; Prof. Alfred Zimmern's "The European Crisis : A Way Out Prof. H. J. Laski's "President Roosevelt and Foreign Opinion", and Mr. J. M Keynes's "National Self-Sufficiency" are all worth reading. The literary artic are scarcely up to the level of this review, but there is a very informing cont bution by the President of the University of Chicago on "Hard Times and th Higher Learning".

The Harvard Theological Review (April). Mr. H. A. Sanders writes on "T Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and *Acts*" ; Mr. W. H. P. Hatch prints "S Coptic Fragments of the *N.T.* from Nitria" ; and Mr. R. P. Casey "A American Version of Athanasius's Letter to Epictetus". Mr. E. R. Goodenou discusses the relation of Philo's *Exposition of the Law* to his *De Vita Mosis.*

The Review and Expositor (July). A helpful article is the Rev. G. S. Dobbins "Facing Pastoral Problems", which poses definite cases. Dr. J. R. Sampe gives some expository notes on *Amos* and Dr. J. W. Shepard writes on "Educa tional Reconstruction on a Christian Basis".

Anglican Theological Review (July). The outstanding articles are Mr. T. C Wedel's survey, "College Students and God", Dr. Douglas Horton's suggestiv "The Oxford Movement and Contemporary American Protestantism", and Mr W. M. V. Hoffman's "Personal Counselling", an examination of recent book on pastoral psychology.

THE SEVENTH THEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE OF CONGREGATIONALISTS.

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

JULY 10th—14th, 1933.

THE SELF-REVELATION OF GOD.

Chairman - DR. R. F. HORTON.

Monday, 10th July. 8.30 p.m. *The Concept of Self-Revelation.* Dr. John Short.

Tuesday, 11th July. Morning. *The Self-Revelation of God in Personality.* Canon C. E. Raven, M.A., D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University and Canon of Ely.
Evening. *The Self-Revelation of God in Conscience.* The Rev. Francis Wrigley, B.A.

Wednesday, 12th July. Morning. *The Self-Revelation of God in the Physical Universe.* Mr. E. Cunningham, M.A., Fellow and Mathematical Lecturer, St. John's College, Cambridge. *The Self-Revelation of God in Animate Nature.* Dr. B. Lee Woolf.
Evening. *The Self-Revelation of God in Holy Men.* The Rev. Frank Lenwood, M.A.

Thursday, 13th July. Morning. *The Self-Revelation of God in Jesus Christ.* The Rev. A. C. Bouquet, D.D., Vicar of All Saints, Cambridge, and Stanton Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion in the University.

AN IMPRESSION.

By DR. ALBERT PEEL.

THE attendance at this, the seventh Conference, was about normal, though this year there seemed to be more women members than usual. Among these it was pleasing to see Mrs. Forsyth, whose presence set us wondering what Dr. Forsyth would have had to say about present-day theology. Many of those present had been at all, or almost all, the previous Conferences, and familiar voices were heard through the discussions, notably those of Drs. A. T. and C. J. Cadoux, the Revs. H. I. Frith, Mary Collins, John Bevan, B. C. Plowright, F. Lenwood, H. Partington, R. W. Thompson, and Mr. H. E. A. Condon. Dr. Horton was his inimitable self in the chair, and the officers of the Conference—the Rev. B. C. Plowright as Vice-Chairman, Mr. A. B. Russell as Treasurer, and the Rev. N. A. Turner-Smith as co-Secretary with Mr. Plowright—all did their work with quiet efficiency. The presence of a number of missionaries was a pleasing feature; among them were Miss H. L. Hawkridge, the Revs. W. F. Dawson, D. Emlyn Evans, and R. A. Hickling. No account of the Conference would be complete without a reference to the Devotional Sessions, in which Mr. Turner-Smith led the prayers along lines appropriate and helpful.

The outstanding personality of the Conference, it is only right to s was a layman, Mr. Cunningham, of St. John's. Not for the first time Cunningham helped not merely by reading a paper but by the tone of contributions to the discussions. With wide and accurate knowledge a intense sincerity, he always contrived to bring the talk back to cent things, and no member of the Conference but felt deeply indebted to h It is to be hoped that the transference of the Conference to Oxford n year will not mean the loss of Mr. Cunningham's assistance.

In Professor Raven and Dr. Bouquet we had the assistance of memb of the Anglican communion, but this year we lacked the presence of visit from other denominations. Often the Faculties of the Theological Colleg in Cambridge have sent their members to enliven the Conference, but t year they were unrepresented. There were two visitors from oversea Dr. Paul Hutchinson, of the *Christian Century,* Chicago, and Dr. Jay Stocking, of St. Louis, who preached the sermon at the International Co gregational Council at Bournemouth in 1930. At one of the inform sessions Dr. Hutchinson gave an account of the religious situation in t United States to-day, and a gloomy picture it was in its description of t effect of the economic depression on the churches. One of the stori which will not soon be forgotten was of a village with three hundred peop and five churches. These five increased to six when the younger membe of a congregation of the denomination which modestly calls itself "T Church of God" rebelled, with the result that it divided into "The Chur of God (Original)" and "The Church of God (Incorporated)". One of t results of the economic depression has been the reunion of the Church God!

The papers printed within speak for themselves. Canon Raven spo extempore with wonderful effect, and we are only able to give his o *résumé* of what he said. I was unable to reach the Conference until af this address, and I found that Canon Raven had made a very deep impr sion on the audience, who had been prepared by Dr. Short's introduct paper. The Rev. Francis Wrigley spoke in characteristically simple a direct fashion on God's Revelation in Conscience, and made a strong p for the ordinary man. A re-arrangement of the programme brought M Cunningham and Dr. Woolf on the same morning, the Rev. F. Lenwo speaking on Wednesday evening and Dr. Bouquet on Thursday morni This re-arrangement was made in order to avoid a small attendance for t last paper. An attempt is to be made next year to form a programme t will not have to be re-arranged, as it is hoped to keep all the members the Conference to the end by concluding the sessions on Thursday aft noon. Dr. Bouquet remained through Thursday morning for a long d cussion of his paper.

Almost the best thing one can do in writing an impression of the Co ference is to refer readers to the Rev. B. C. Plowright's able summary the *Christian World* of 20th July, in which the salient features of the di cussions are well brought out. At times the criticism was very keen, a when writers of papers were accused of selecting their data or of treati their subjects in an "appalling" way. In the more informal Comm Room talks there was persistent heckling and a refusal to be satisfied wit anything less than the truth. On at least one occasion in the course these discussions, intellect and emotion came together, and there was deep sense of that *numinous* which was emphasized in more than one the papers. That night everybody went quietly to bed, and we hear nothing of a *basso profundo* which seemed on other occasions to be tryi to last out to greet the morning light. Even these spiritual experience

however, did not go beyond criticism, as there were those who felt that this fusing of head and heart was only reached at the expense of reason and by blotting out some of those disturbing features of nature which seem almost impossible to reconcile with the love of God.

Once more we were struck by the fact that even in a Conference of this kind, acquaintance with literature on the different problems seems comparatively limited. Time after time when conversation was ranging round the question of personality, and especially the personality of God, we noted, "Why doesn't somebody quote Wieman?". Professor H. N. Wieman, of Chicago, has now for some years been advocating a conception of God which denies personality to Him. This is not the place to examine his theories, which have been scrutinized with great care in America, but they were extremely germane to the Conference. It was not until Dr. Stocking intervened that Wieman's name was so much as mentioned. The Conference convinced me that some way must be found in order to increase the speed by which acquaintance with the work of scholars on one side of the Atlantic is secured by those on the other. Perhaps the series of volumes of *Contemporary American Theology* will help to bring this about, while *The Congregational Quarterly* hopes to be able to contribute a little to this end if finances permit the development of the proposed co-operation with American Congregationalists.

While perhaps it is unfair to expect that knowledge shall cross the Atlantic and permeate to students in this country with great speed, we should be able to surmount denominational barriers and learn of the work of scholars in our own country, more especially when they are connected with movements parallel to those to which we belong. One of the speakers quoted as an authority a Mr. Russell, with initials incorrectly stated, "a schoolmaster somewhere on the south coast". A critic had not only never heard of Mr. Russell, but spoke rather contemptuously about him. The Rev. C. F. Russell, whose *Religion and Natural Law* was, I think, the book in question, left King Edward's School, Southampton, where he was Headmaster, to become Headmaster of the Merchant Taylors' School, Great Crosby, in 1929. He has been a Hulsean Lecturer in Cambridge, but, what is perhaps more important, has for long been a leading member of the Modern Churchmen's Union. He occupies, in fact, a position in the Modern Churchmen's Conferences not unlike that of Mr. Cunningham in the Congregational Conference. And yet we seem not so much as to have heard that there is a C. F. Russell.

From another angle the Conference was extremely convincing. It becomes more and more manifest that the best results are to be secured, both spiritually and intellectually, by a group that is not too large. We have long advocated the development of churches from large congregations into smaller groups in which all the members can get to know each other and so be able to serve one another. That, we believe, when all the tumult and shouting has died, will be the most important contribution the "Group Movement" has to make to religious life. The same development could take place with advantage in intellectual matters. A college can be far too big, and so can a Conference. The fusing of the members of the Conference into a unity, with the blessings that came in deep religious experience, was only possible because the Conference could be accommodated in a room of comparatively small size.

Next year the Conference will probably be held in Oxford, early in July. The London members of the Committee were asked to arrange the details of the programme. The subject will be "The Nature of Authority".

THE CONCEPT OF SELF-REVELATION.

By Dr. John Short.

The importance of the subject to be discussed is to be measured not o by its value for our witness as ministers of the Gospel of Christ, but e more in view of the widespread idea that belief in God, or, more genera the Supernatural, is no longer possible for truly enlightened minds. take the latter point first, few will challenge the statement made in Encyclical of the Archbishops and Bishops in the Lambeth Conference 1930 :—

> We are aware of the extent to which the very thought of God seems be passing away from the minds and hearts of many, even in nomina Christian nations. The ten years since we last met have seen the devel ment of one vast political and social experiment which is, at le professedly, rooted in denial of God's existence. Even where God is s acknowledged, He is often regarded as too elusive or remote to be releva to the practical concerns of life. And it is not surprising that where bel in God has weakened, the sense of sin has in large measure disappear morality has shown signs of degenerating into little more than a recognit of the value of kindness, and the supreme good has almost come to be thoug of in terms of comfort or excitement.

This is a point that we ought to keep in mind if we are to deal seriou with the realities of the situation, and, as already stated, it measures gravity and importance of the subject under discussion.

With reference to the first point, it seems true to say that there grave divergencies of view in the Church itself, and consequently there a note of uncertainty in our proclamation of the Gospel. The repercussi of such divergencies are being keenly felt by our own people, and we r be sure that acute minds outside of Church circles and Church life taking note of the situation. Let us hope and pray that this Confere will arrive at a unanimous point of view with regard to the central c victions of our faith. The value at the present time of a unanim expression of our beliefs can hardly be estimated. It is in our power perform a great service for our denomination as a whole, and this C ference provides us with a wonderful opportunity that we ought not to l

Let me sum up the general situation which forms the backgroun our discussions with the following quotation from Professor A. E. Tayl Gifford Lecture :

> The infinitely serious issue for the whole future of European Civiliza is that of the soundness of the Christian ideal of human character and Christian rule of life. If we can still maintain that in that rule and i we have something absolute and permanent, authoritative for Europe of our own age no less than for Jewish and Hellenistic communities of t first century, or for our own ancestors of the thirteenth and seventeenth, it certain that the Christian religion will survive uninjured any criticism it ma have to encounter from biologists or anthropologists. If the finality of t Christian ideal of personal character and the Christian rule of cond cannot be maintained, no temporary success of the apologist in rebutti this or that ill-considered "scientific" or "historical" criticism can alter t fact that the Christian faith, as a religion, is under sentence of death. A it is a chief symptom of the mental condition of our age that this precise iss is being pressed upon us with a wholesomely relentless insistence . . . T spirit of man, we are told on all sides, has " found new paths", and mu walk in them.

[1] *The Faith of a Moralist*, I. 10-11.

These are grave words that do not leave the Christian Church in any degree of doubt as to its main task. It is our great duty and privilege to flood the world with a sense of the reality of God, and to help men and women to identify Him as He reveals Himself to them.

We may admit at once that that is not an easy matter. To believe in the existence of God *after the belief is once acquired* is easy. But in that sense all belief is easy. The sober truth is that no belief is more difficult to acquire than belief in the existence of God, and the reason is that such belief, to be of any value, must not be a *minimum* belief; it must be a *maximum* belief. It must be a maximum belief because it always commits us to many other beliefs that are congruent with itself. The Scottish philosopher, Hume, arguing, in his dialogue, through the person of Philo, has said a pregnant and final word on this matter when he maintains that a limited and finite God can meet the demands neither of religion nor of theology.

To come to closer grips with the subject of this paper, it can be said that there is one outstanding fact in our favour, and that is that religion is universal and coeval with man: atheism, or secularism, is a relatively modern phenomenon. Any study of history will bear this out. And the religious impulse persists even in the most thorough-going aspects of modern secularism. It is marked by the same passion, and by the same devotion to a cause. Even in Communist Russia it persists in perverted form, with *Das Kapital* for its bible and Lenin for its god. The fundamental religious impulse is all pervasive through human life. Man is religious because he must be: he cannot help himself. He feels the need to come to terms with the mystery of the world, of life and of death. His specifically human capacities of reason, of emotion, of will, imagination, and conscience press upon him the consciousness that he is made for a more-than-terrestrial environment, and that yearning for a larger, fuller life must find satisfaction if his spirit is to know the blessings of rest and peace.

We are committed to the view that this feeling of need, which is the first spring of religion, is the symptom that man is made for God, and for fellowship with God, and we can echo the finality of Augustine's well-known words,

> Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they rest in Thee.

It is here that we must begin, for the basal religious impulses are primarily practical and not theoretical. That is why the well-known philosophical and theological arguments for the existence of God have failed to bring conviction. It has been argued that God must exist as the ground and explanation of the inter-related series of events that comprise the order of nature, that the appearance of design warrants the inference that a Supreme Intelligence has been at work, that the moral and rational nature of man must be derived from something or someone at least akin to himself, but probably possessing these attributes to a much greater degree.

Without detracting in the least from the value of these arguments it can be at once said that they do not determine anything more than the existence of something, and that something need not possess the characteristics ascribed to it by the religious mind. The first argument permits us, logically, to say no more than that there must be an adequate ground of all that exists. Despite Dr. F. R. Tennant's persuasive discussion of the teleological argument in his *Philosophical Theology*, the argument from design is not by itself valid and sufficient as a ground for belief in God. At most it suggests the inference that the order of nature is the product of a cause powerful enough to have produced it. By itself, that does not

lead us to infer that this power is the God revealed through Christ. T truth is that very many, so far from being led into belief through obser tion of the order of the universe, have lost what beliefs they had.

The moral argument, which is the most powerful of the three, logica states no more than that the cause must be adequate to the effect, but t leaves us still far removed from any confirmation of the existence of God and Father of our Lord.

At their best the philosophical arguments do not afford sufficient grou for belief in God in the Christian sense of the term. In passing, I may a that I am not attempting to state or to criticize the arguments of mode psychology against, or for, any belief in Divine Existence. When psych ogy attempts to philosophize it only succeeds in making itself absurd.

Our starting-point must be the nature of religious experience itself, an as I have already suggested, the universality of the religious impul affords us a solid basis for discussion.

The question that is inevitably raised by the *fact* of religious experien is, "What are the conditions that make such experience possible?". B we had better begin by examining the nature of religious experience itsel

In general, in the absence of some form of "immediate experience", r knowledge of any kind is at all possible: it is with such experience that a knowledge begins. By "immediate experience" I mean our consciousne of ourselves, and our "feeling" for other selves and the environment which we live. As Prof. Kemp Smith has well put it,[1]

> Knowledge starts neither from sense-data, nor from general princip but from the complex situation in which the human race finds itself at t dawn of self-consciousness.

It is our feeling of one-ness with this "complex situation" that characteristic of "immediate experience".

In all such experience revelation has its place, for experience always volves two factors, in the absence of any one of which there could be experience at all. On the *subjective* side there is *"awareness"* of grea or lesser degree: on the *objective* side there is *"that"* of which we aware. Something must be "revealed" or "given" before there can any "awareness" of it, and before there can be any "experience" at all. philosophy would put it,

> All consciousness is consciousness of objects,

or,

> All awareness is awareness of meaning;

and "meaning" is always objective in content. Further, such experier is the sole test of "truth" or "reality" that we possess.

As Baron von Hügel puts it:[2]

> Man's actual experiences, the data with which he starts, are never simp impressions which are felt by man at the time of his receiving them as pure subjective, or which can be shown to be purely subjective by philosoph analysis, or which in reason man ought to assume to be merely subjectiv unless a strict demonstration of their trans-subjectivity be forthcoming. T data of man's actual experiences, on the contrary, are subject and objec each given to and taking the other: the two, and not the one only, a included within the single human consciousness.

Religious experience is in exactly the same case, though, like othe specific forms of experience, it exhibits its own distinctive marks. Religio begins with some "immediate feeling", or "intuition", that often lies deep

1 *Commentary to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason,* Introduction.
2 *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion,* I.

embedded in no ordinary consciousness, of being in some kind of relationship with a reality that is, at the same time, other than ourselves. There is an element of knowledge of the "Beyond" in it that is common to all forms and stages of religious experience, from that of the most primitive and backward peoples of the world to that of the great Christian mystics. Religion simply could not exist without some kind of awareness of God, however varied conceptions of Deity may be. It begins, not with any proof of God's existence, but in our identification of Him as He gives Himself to us, and with our response to some revelation of Himself.

The fact of religion, then, enables us to proceed on the basis that man is susceptible to religious realities. Elements in the susceptibility are an awareness of an "other" which is disclosing itself to him. In its more specific character it is a realization of the *Supreme*. It involves the thought that through communion with the Supreme, light will be cast on the mystery of the world and of human life, and that such contact will provide us with means for understanding, and even overcoming, the troubles of life. Above all, it involves the truth that, since religious experiences are similar in type to other kinds of human experience, our susceptibility to God is aroused by a revelation of Himself. Otherwise knowledge of Him could never be possible.

Plenty of difficulties, of course, remain when we realize that our faith must be a maximum faith, but these are of another order. That is to say, though God may be unfathomable, He is not unknowable. It is precisely because He reveals Himself that we can and do know Him.

Prof. A. N. Whitehead states the case, though in vaguer language than we feel it necessary to employ :

> Religion is the vision of something which stands beyond, behind, and within, the passing flux of immediate things, something which is real, and yet waiting to be realized; something which is a remote possibility and yet the greatest of present facts ; something which gives meaning to all that passes, and yet eludes apprehension ; something whose possession is the final good, and yet is beyond all reach ; something which is the ultimate ideal, and the hopeless quest.[1]

Or in more confident fashion from von Hügel, who writes with interior knowledge[2] :

> Religion, even more than all the convictions that claim correspondence with the race, begins and proceeds and ends with the "Given"—with existences, realities, which environ and penetrate us, and which we have always anew to capture and combine, to fathom and apprehend ; all this, however, neither as springing from scepticism nor as leading to it, but on the contrary, as stimulated and sustained by a tenacious conviction that a real, if dim, "confused" knowledge of reality is with us already prior to all our attempts clearly to analyse or completely to synthesize it.

To put it otherwise, religious faith does not invent its facts : the great convictions of faith do not create themselves. This is what we find when we turn to the Hebrew scriptures. There, no attempt is made to argue that God exists. The starting-point of all the writers is their immediate experience of God, and of vital contact with Him. As A. B. Davidson has put it[3],

> If men know God, it is because He has made Himself known to them. The idea of man reaching to knowledge or fellowship with God through his own efforts is foreign to the Old Testament. Moses and the prophets are nowhere represented as thoughtful minds reflecting on the Unseen and

1 *Science and the Modern World.*
2 *Essays and Addresses,* 1, Pref.
3 *H.D.B.,* II. 195.

ascending to elevated conceptions of Godhead : the Unseen manifests it to them, and they know it.

A close study of the religious beliefs and teachings of the Hebr prophets will make this clear, though for the purposes of this paper a f general considerations must suffice. Doubtless in scripture it is made cl that God reveals Himself through nature—such is the testimony of t *Psalms*—but it may be argued that the Psalmist came to the contemplati of nature with antecedent conceptions of God. Again, it is plain that G reveals Himself through history, especially in the chequered history Israel, but assurance concerning the revelation comes through the prophe conception of God which enabled them to discern His purposes in His de ings with His people. Scripture makes it abundantly clear that the prima revelation of God came through the quickened consciousness of historic persons.

The Hebrew prophets, in every case, were men who were conscious tha God was speaking to them : it was their part to listen, and to obey His wil As to the prophetic genius itself, it has been said that they were men o vicarious insight, and that is just as natural and credible as vicarious suffe ing. In dealing with them God has taken the initiative and they felt them selves to be supernaturally inspired. They perceived the *"truth"* that Go desired them to know, intuitively, and their attitude is sufficient indicatio that they did not reach the conviction as the outcome of their own delibera tion. They shrank from the realization of His Presence; they were pai fully aware of their own inadequacy and unworthiness; they felt the hea burden of the Divine communication. They felt that they had been co strained to listen, and when they had listened, they felt that they must obe

> The prophets of Israel, if any in the world's history can be so describe are supernaturally inspired men, bringing truth on which ever since t world has lived, and will continue to live.[1]

We are not surprised, therefore, to find in Scripture a growing apprehe sion of God as He is revealed through the prophetic consciousness. Fro Amos on there is an ever clearer conception of the character and purpose God, a purpose which the prophets see is interwoven with the history Israel.

For Amos, God is *absolute righteousness,* Who requires a like righteou ness in His chosen people. A tenderer note is struck by Hosea, who reve God as *Divine love* that is unwearied by the infidelities He abhors. Isai and Ezekiel emphasize the supra-mundane glory of God, and Jeremiah, pe haps the greatest of them all, scales the heights by emphasizing not o ethical monotheism, but also the personal relationship between God a the individual soul.

As we study the range of Hebrew prophecy we become conscious th here indeed the Supernatural is revealing Himself. These men could neve out of their own unaided reason, have invented the things they declare. I history bears any witness to "Reality" at all, the history of Hebrew pro phecy surely makes it clear that God does reveal Himself to man.

But even Hebrew prophecy does not exhaust our testimony to the fac of God's self-revelation through human experience. There is a real sens in which Hebrew prophecy, though providing evidence of a progressiv revelation of God, is not complete, and is not sufficient. We cannot bu remember that the prophetic message is often confused, and leaves us wit many great concepts unfixed as to their meaning and content. Often alongside a sublime passage, there are other passages difficult to reconci with the *New Testament* conception of God.

[1] H. R. Mackintosh, *The Christian Apprehension of God.*

Is it possible for us to maintain that God's self-revelation has gone even farther? I think we can, and that in the light of the evidence we possess we must. As Professor H. H. Farmer has pointed out[1], being religious always goes farther and particularizes God. It affirms that God is real, and that He is sacred purpose, but only in and through quite particular statements as to what His character is, and what His purpose demands.

That is why among the credenda of the great positive religions we find in every case assertions about certain historical facts. It is especially the case with Christianity. Moreover, any attempt to spiritualize such religions, and especially Christianity, by eliminating the historical, would go a long way to destroy them. The truth is that the religion which will most successfully deal with the practical task of the re-organization of life with God as its centre will be that religion which brings God most successfully down to the historical story of His creatures. To emphasize, therefore, the historical elements in religion is not so much a sign of weakness, but, on the contrary, a proof of strength. It can be held that the completest revelation of God possible to man will be an actual, temporal life, subject to the limitations and contingencies of such a life, yet one that is in all its details a complete and adequate vehicle of the Eternal.

The central contention of the Christian faith is that such a life has already been lived. This conviction gives Christianity its distinctive character, and we may only modify it to our own peril and the stultification of our witness. Obviously such a conviction calls for an act of faith, as it cannot be established by an appeal solely to empirical evidence. But the faith has been, and will be, justified in its results.

It is also true that we are in possession of comparatively few facts of the life of our Lord. Yet, making every reasonable allowance for criticism of the documents, it is possible to interpret the life and witness of our Lord in such fashion as to render consistent the claims of Christianity with regard to His Person. Let it be noted that the *real* appeal to history is of quite different nature to that which is frequently made. The real appeal to history is the question whether our Lord has brought into human life *a new spiritual quality*.

And surely the answer is not in doubt. He was obviously much more than a prophet. We can distinguish between the prophets and the message they proclaimed, but Jesus Christ is inseparable from His disclosure of God. Dr. D. S. Cairns has stated the difference in striking language[2].

> When we think of Amos, we think of his stern message of God's justice, and with Hosea we associate the message of God's love. But the converse is untrue. Where we think of the Righteousness of God or of His Love, who remembers either Hosea or Amos? But when we think of God as "the Father" we think at once of "the Son".

Let us remind ourselves briefly what Christ's revelation of God was. It is true that verbal parallels to His teaching may be found in *O.T.* writings, yet His own utterances are characterized by a new consistency and a new purity. The old concepts are filled in with a fuller meaning, and the reason is that behind His words, great as they are, was the greater wonder of Himself. In the words of Goethe, "The Highest cannot be spoken", and we remember that Christ passed beyond words. It is the Cross that is the climax of His revelation of God, and the Christian mind in every age has found in the Cross the great apocalypse. There He unveiled a fatherhood of such dimensions that at last it reveals Divine sacrifice. The *O.T.* had

1 *Experience of God.*
2 *Christianity in the Modern World*, 44.

little to say of the cost of human redemption, but Christ drew the curta and revealed the Father's heart.

The Christian mind has never been truer to itself than when it comes sing

> Were the whole realm of nature mine,
> That were an offering far too small ;
> Love so amazing, so divine,
> Demands my soul, my life, my all.

It is the thought of "Christ crucified" that compels Paul to write, "Go was in Jesus Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself". In the light of th Cross both "Fatherhood" and "Love" take on new, rich meanings. Th revelation of God in Christ has fixed them for ever. Our appeal to history then, leaves us in no doubt. Our Lord *has brought a new spiritual quali* into human life.

If we turn to the records of early Christianity we do not find that th faith of the early Christians was either based on our Lord's biography o that it was the outcome of reflection upon His moral teaching? Historica Christianity is not the religion of Jesus; it centres upon His Person.

Those who were nearest to Him in time felt themselves in contact wit a "numinous" personality. For them He had the value of God: throug Him they came to a knowledge of God. God for them was mediate through the Person of Christ.

If we recall the struggle with Gnosticism and Docetism which bega before the later writings of the *N.T.* were penned, we see clearly that th instinct of the Church was sound, for the victory of the heretics would ha killed its spiritual life. To yield to such attempts at re-interpretation, divest the Person of Christ of the attributes ascribed to Him, would te to reduce the Supreme Reality into a matter of mere "universals". T result of that procedure would be to degrade Christianity into a theosophy

But the Church, in the main, followed a more creative line of develo ment, the line that we find in the Pauline and Johannine writings. Th are concerned with the significance of Christ, and but little with the deta of His earthly life, though those are important. The goal of Christianity f Paul and John is the reproduction of the life of the "Pre-existent" Chr in their own lives and those of His followers. "Eternal life is to kn God, and Christ whom He has sent". "Let this mind be in you which w also in Christ Jesus", and again, these striking opening verses of *Hebrew*

> God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past u the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by H Son, . . . who (is) the brightness of His glory, and the express image His person.

These and many other passages make the *N.T.* position quite clear. T early Christians found God *through* Christ, because they found God Christ, and that experience of God in Christ is the mainspring of what ma be termed *N.T.* Christology.

Again I would seek to emphasize the fact that God's self-revelation ha always come through the immediate experience of historical persons, an again I would point out, for it is the crux of the real problem we are he dealing with, that the religion which most successfully grapples with th practical task of reorganizing life, a reorganization that is urgently calle for at the present time, with God at its centre, will be that very religio which brings *God* most intimately down into the historical story of ma kind. My own faith is, having regard to the details of our Lord's earth

[1] See *The Faith of a Moralist,* II. iii.

life and especially of His Passion and Resurrection, this has been finally accomplished.

He is "the Life". *John* has put the authentic word into the mouth of our Lord, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father". If we set these claims aside as an overstatement of the truth, the problem I have posed still remains to be solved, but if Christ be set aside as a final revelation of God to man, whom shall we put in His place?

And in the last place, once we have identified God in Christ, how wonderfully we are helped to identify Him in the ordinary experiences of daily life. It is *this* spirit that draws us together in those bonds of loyalty and fellowship that make of us a Church. It is the touch of the Spirit that was in Christ that quiets our hearts and fills us with peace as we meet at His table and remember His Passion. It is the living Spirit of Christ that is behind, and in, the forces that are compelling men at least to recognize that co-operative fellowship and friendship provide the only possible relationships in which real happiness and prosperity are likely to be found. It is this Spirit that is in the vast desire for truth that is such a characteristic feature of modern life. He Who said, "I am the truth", must reveal Himself in the desire for it, though, as yet, men do not recognize Him. He is the real and generous goodness of human life, whether that goodness be God-conscious or not, for He is the fountain of all good, and He is in the love that uplifts and ennobles life. If men do not learn to see Him in these things how will they recognize Him when they stand in His presence?

We see Him there because His Spirit has touched us and given us our sight. In His light we see light. It is now our task to reveal Him to our fellow men, to mediate His Spirit to them, that through our lives, our fellowship and our message they may come to know Him "whom to know is life eternal". There is no incompatibility between the modern conception of the universe and the preaching of Christ as the "One" in whom the *fullness of God* is revealed.

THE SELF-REVELATION OF GOD IN PERSONALITY.

By Canon C. E. Raven, D.D.

You have entrusted to me a new subject. The self-revelation of God in nature, in mankind, in Scripture and the Church, in Christ and His Saints —these are familiar : but the interest in personality, the conviction that it is the holiest thing in the universe is quite new, and for the Christian full of encouragement.

This interest is due to : (a) the development of democratic ideas : Burns might protest that "a man's a man for a' that", but it is only recently (and not even yet universally) that a sense of the value and uniqueness of personality has outweighed more superficial judgments of man's worth.

(b) The revolt against analytical methods—in science, in education, in psychology and in philosophy. We have discovered that the whole is greater than the sum of its analysable parts.

(c) In religion the shifting of interest from objective dogma to experience and the consequent attention to mysticism and to worship.

It is with this third development that we are to-day chiefly concerned.

I begin with an aphorism or dogma, perhaps unjustifiably violent—that man is truly man and specifically distinct, because in him the self-revelation

of God is first consciously apprehended. Man is not *homo sapiens* or *hor faber* as Bergson would have it, or even *l'homme qui rit*. He is man virtue of his capacity for worship, that is for experiencing, receiving a co-operating with God's self-revelation. This experience is essentially act of the whole personality; is in fact the act by which personality proper so called comes into being. Religion is on this showing the characterist human quality.

Otto has familiarized us with the idea of the numinous. Surely man distinctive powers are all derived from this fundamental experience. Sel consciousness is a discovery of the universe over against ourselves, a cosm emotion of isolation and of communion, an awareness of something persona in the universe above and around him. This does not mean that primitiv man is conscious of God or of worship: but that as the source of his man hood he has an experience of the universe which is in essence religious an is in fact the germ from which religion in all its varied forms has sprung.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not supporting the idea once popula that primitive man was a monotheist with a definite belief in a single an supreme God. I think that such an idea ascribes to him a power o formulated thought which he did not reach until very many ages ha passed. No: all I seek to maintain is that the undifferentiated and un analysed awe with which man discovered his self-hood over against hi environment is essentially the religious experience in its simplest form. I is mysticism: it is worship: it is the emergence of the eternal, it is th response of personality to the self-revelation in it of God. If so, then is indeed from God's good gift that all our human qualities derive then selves.

For it is in his effort to formulate and comprehend this native awe th man develops his art, his science, his ethics: fine words to apply to fetish and totems, to myths and stories, to taboos and codes—crude, childis fantastic, yes, but moments in the Jacob-wrestle of the race through t night with the unknown lover and enemy, until at last he can wring fro Him His name.

I need not trace the stages of that long agony. Dr. Oman has done s supremely well. But it is relevant to note that when man has striven t express the strange reality of which he is conscious in the universe animisms and polytheisms, by deisms and pantheisms, it is at last in pe sonality itself, the personality of a Son of Man, that he finds the supre and only adequate symbol of the unknown God.

Rather than trace this process in detail, I would turn from history (pre-history) to experience, and seek to justify there my claim that *vi hominum visio Dei*, that man is made in the image of God, that in perso ality God accomplishes His self-revelation.

Much of the confusion about mysticism is due, as we all know, to diffi culty of definition—the one word being used to cover a variety of experience varying from crude and primitive to sublime and eternal.

Here I am going to suggest that the difficulty chiefly arises because we fail to recognize that all these experiences have this in common—they are all activities of the undifferentiated or whole personality in its apprehension of the universal. Just as in the development of the race, from the elemen tary awe of the numinous to the saint's communion with God, there is an evolution of man's religious consciousness, so, in mysticism, from the dreams of the drug-addict or the drunkard to the ecstasy that follows long torment or deliberate self-discipline, and so on to the inspiration and dynamic energy of the God-possessed there is the evolution of a single type of human achievement.

When the personality is unified and undistracted at whatever level, there is an apprehension at that level of the self-revelation of God.

A broad line can be drawn between two stages of this evolution: the personality can be unified either by what Murisier called subtraction—drink, crystal-gazing, struggle and exhaustion, asceticism, reaction—or by sublimation: in the one case there is a stripping off of distractions; in the other there is a true integration. Both yield a real experience: it is only worthy to be called religious in the latter case—when it becomes inspiration, an energizing of the whole man by worship and communion.

THE SELF-REVELATION OF GOD IN CONSCIENCE.

By The Rev. Francis Wrigley, B.A.

Was it not Kepler who said that in studying the ways of the universe he was thinking the thoughts of God after Him? That is exactly what the scientists are doing, thinking the thoughts of God after Him. And that is what we are doing when we are studying the moral universe and the laws of the good life and the ideals that flash across the soul. We are thinking the thoughts of God after Him. His thoughts are revealed not only in the starry heavens without, but in the moral world within. The heavens declare His glory, and the conscience reveals His holiness. They are both forms of God's self-expression. Amiel was right when he declared that if man is capable of conceiving goodness, the general principle of things which cannot be inferior to man must be good. To express it in the words of another teacher, "It is inconceivable that God should weave into a man's soul a moral sense which does not answer to His own nature".

I hold that every man who has a sense of *ought,* who distinguishes right from wrong, who believes in the supremacy of moral values, who has the vision of moral ideals that he feels he must follow and if possible attain, that man has within him a revelation of God.

This is my own approach to religion. It is under the pressure of this belief that I find God. I agree with Estlin Carpenter that if we cannot discover the witness of God's presence in our own thought and conscience we can never discover Him at all. The revelation from Nature, from History, from the Bible, from Christ, are all contingent on the revelation in our own soul. I frankly confess that it is from the ethical side that I have found and do find my own way to the realization of God. And, in this, I believe I represent a great body of plain folk, and it is valuable to have, in these theological conferences, the plain man's point of view—the point of view of the man who has no philosophical equipment, who possesses no mystical gift (as that is commonly understood), and can lay claim to no dramatic spiritual experience such as Dr. Dale's historic experience of "the living Christ". The revelation of God in Conscience is fundamental, far-reaching and, as far as it goes, final.

"He who traces nothing of God in his own soul", writes Carlyle in his Journal, "will never find God in the world of matter. It is in the soul of man that the Highest can disclose itself face to face". Here we stand on sure ground. Religion rests on the indubitable intuitions of the human soul. "Religion", says von Hügel, "is essentially *Revelation*—man's deepest experience of the Ultimate Reality, through the action of that Reality itself". I venture to add that man's deepest experience of the Ultimate Reality is in the conscience.

I want, first of all, then, to speak of the content of that Revelation, th[en] of its validity, and, thirdly, of its supreme religious significance.

I—The Content of the Revelation.

I think our moral consciousness includes three things :

(1) The faculty for moral distinctions, or the sense of right an[d] wrong.
(2) The feeling of moral obligation, or the sense of duty.
(3) The perception of moral ideals, the vision of high things beyon[d] us, towards which our souls must strive.

In these three ways we recognize in ourselves the presence and the pressur[e] of a Supreme Power Whose we are and Whom we ought to serve—in ou[r] sense of right and wrong, a Power that is righteous, in our feeling of mora[l] obligation, a Power that claims our allegiance, in our perception of mora[l] ideals, a Power that summons us to high service and seeks our co-operation in the making of a better world.

We know, without argument and without question, that certain things are base and mean and that other things are noble and right. We know, at once, in our best moments, that selfishness and lust and untruthfulness and jealousy and pride and hatred are wrong and despicable, even though we may practise them. We know at once that love and sacrifice and purity and fidelity are the worshipful things, and that, in the great words of Frederick Robertson, "it is better, it is nobler, to be generous than selfish, to be chaste than licentious, to be true than false, to be brave than be a coward". This is our sure glimpse into the reality of a moral universe.

What Frederick Robertson failed to see, in his hour of spiritual eclipse, when it seemed to him as if God had disappeared from his life and he was alone, was that in trusting and holding fast to those things which he said were certain still—the grand simple landmarks of morality—he was really revealing his faith in a supreme and righteous Power Who was making His presence known to him in the very existence of the moral universe and in making His message clear in the authentic notes of the moral law. It is this revelation of God in the conscience of man—this gradual and progressive revelation, from the crude beginnings of moral life in the primeval forest to the finest expression of it in the prophets and the saints—that runs like a golden thread through the annals of the past and that has given to the human soul its dignity, its pathos, its glory, and its romance.

I am speaking in Cambridge, and I cannot forget an incident which took place 150 years ago in connexion with this University. A young graduate, 25 years of age, had just read a prize essay on the subject, "Was it right to make slaves of men against their will?". He then set out on horseback for London. But he could not rest. He could not get out of his mind the ghastly horrors of the slave trade ; they haunted his memory. The awful sin of slavery was burnt in upon his conscience. He saw it now for what it was, a colossal crime against the bodies and the souls of men, and at last he got down from his horse, knelt by the roadside, and quietly but resolutely dedicated himself to God and to a campaign for abolishing the slave trade under the British flag. The spot where he knelt, two miles this side of Ware in Herts, is marked by a simple and unpretentious stone, recording the fact that in the month of June, 1785, Thomas Clarkson made there one of the supreme decisions of history.

In that story you see in all the glow and colour of real life the self-revelation of God in the conscience of a great soul. It is all there, the sense of something tragically wrong, the supreme challenge of a moral ideal, the overwhelming sense of moral obligation. Here we see God at

work in the moral education of the race. That episode is just an epitome of an age-long conflict between the good and evil forces in the world—the conflict between right and wrong, between fact and ideal, between pleasure and duty, between truth and falsehood; and this is the conflict which, under a thousand forms, is being waged to-day in every home, in every city, in every continent, and in every heart. We know that in this conflict we are witnessing the real issues of life fought out, and we know, too, that it is God Who has called us to enter the conflict, and it is His Will that constitutes the very motif of the campaign.

II—Its Validity.

What is our answer to those who do not recognize any authority in conscience, who say that right and wrong are purely matters of personal opinion, and that there is no such thing as moral law, that the only authority they admit is the authority of their strongest instincts or their own imperious desires.

Canon Peter Green tells us that after delivering a course of lectures at a northern University on "The Science of Conduct", he received a letter from a woman graduate who had taken a high degree. She wrote, "How can there be a science of conduct when right and wrong are purely matters of personal taste and opinion?". Canon Green replied, "You might as well ask how there can be a science of medicine when the question whether arsenic is good for a baby is purely a matter of taste and opinion. But it is not. The facts of medical science rest on the bodily, as the facts of moral science rest on the spiritual, nature of man". The graduate replied, "You may be right, but none of the clever and highly educated men and women I mix with accept any moral laws at all". Shortly after, the Canon had a visit, one evening, from four Shop Stewards, who wished to protest against something he had written about the teaching of Karl Marx. They were superior, thoughtful men, pleasant and courteous in their manners, but all declared that they, and the great mass of the workers, repudiated utterly all belief in a moral law and accepted Marx's teaching that morality was a baseless delusion. Now I question entirely the truth of that judgment. I have lived among the working classes for nearly forty years, and I should say that the men of this country, in the main, have an instinctive and deep respect for the moral law and would resent such a statement of their position. At the same time, it must be admitted that atheistic communism is a growing force.

There is no denying the rapid spread of a school of thought that repudiates all moral sanctions and all moral authority, and regards conscience as an outworn superstition, the survival of ancient tribal customs and taboos which the new world has outgrown. How can we meet this fundamental scepticism?

What is the reply? Well, there is really no dialectical reply. The issue is one that cannot be determined by the intellect; the appeal is to a tribunal deeper than the intellect, to an inner sanction which you must either trust or deny. I feel with Dr. Gore that our whole moral position rests on an act of faith. "I take my stand", he says, "on this principle that the idea of absolute values on which the good life is based is an ultimate act of faith". Is it not so? It cannot rest on any logical demonstration. No man, by any argument, however skilfully drawn, can be brought to believe in duty, goodness, or moral distinctions and moral values, any more than he can, by argument, come to distinguish colours, or see beauty in a landscape, or by any process of reasoning come to believe, with any assurance, in personal immortality. Ultimately religion rests on

intuition, on an act of faith, in believing first of all that right and wro do exist, that there are some things we ought to do and other things ought not to do, that purity and love and truth and goodness are intrins ally valuable and worshipful.

Mr. J. L. Paton once put this matter quite concretely in an article " Teaching Virtue ". " When the teacher tries to base his moral thes on reason, he is simply fostering sophistry. No man can prove to me th I ought to love my neighbour. What reason suggests to me as my du towards my neighbour is rather what the little girl answered the curate- ' To keep an eye on him '. Still less can reason prove to me that I ougi to love my father. In the matter of goodness the appeal is to an inn sanction that lies deeper than the intellect. ' There is,' said Jowett Balliol, ' an unreasoning element in the higher nature of man ' ".

Yes, that is true : "Why should I do the right if it hurts me? Who o what laid upon my conscience that categorical imperative? There is n explanation but the transcendental one ". So wrote " J. B." once in th *Christian World*. We say that the moral faculties reveal the existence c a moral universe, just as the faculties of sight and sound reveal th existence of a physical universe. So we trust the validity of our faculti and we say that the things they reveal are real things ; they bring us int touch with ultimate Reality, and we are prepared to base our life upo them, to trust them and to feel sure our trust will be vindicated in the en Have we not as much reason to believe in the objective world of mor values as in an objective world of material things? In either case th mind makes a leap. From the sensations of colour, sound and resistanc it leaps to the conviction that there is an objective reality which excit the sensations. From the feelings of right and wrong, from the intuitio of truth and honour and duty, it leaps to the conviction that there is a objective reality that excites these emotions within the soul, and th objective reality is God. We feel, we know, they are not self-created. T feeling of *ought, e.g.,* cannot possibly spring from self-love or self-interes for it urges men to do things that sometimes involve absolute sacrific "If", Dr. Orchard once said, "the feeling of 'oughtness' does not furni us with a clue to the ultimate reality, it is no use our trusting to any oth feeling ".

The moral ideals, too, which shine before our eyes, ideals of huma brotherhood and international co-operation and international peace, a not fashioned out of our own experience ; they are lights shining in t heavens that lure us on, lovely pictures that God Himself has painted the soul to challenge us to noble thought and high endeavour. They sure give us a clear insight into the nature of ultimate Reality. They reve to us what God is like and what God wants us and the world to be.

We know, of course, that moral values have a natural history. They are, as Dr. Miall Edwards says, " the blossoms whose roots are in th deep sub-soil of the world ". But it is the last term in an evolutionary process that best reveals the nature of its first principle, and so "these highest values of ours are authentic intimations of the nature of Reality "

We cannot forget, however, that it has been an evolutionary proces and we must recognize the fact with all its implications. We must can didly admit that the self-revelation of God in Conscience has been a growing thing. It has been a progressive revelation. In other words, me have risen gradually to a realization of the moral law and the moral ideal just as step by step they have risen to a knowledge of the material universe.

We do not deny the validity of the intellect because, as history shows, the human mind has passed out of illusion into reality, out of error int

truth; no more can we doubt the validity of conscience because it too has developed out of lowly and strange beginnings, in harmony with the evolutionary principle upon which the world was built. "The rising standard of Conscience is nothing less than the growing revelation of God". The pages of history reveal how slow sometimes this progressive revelation is, how in the past men, good men, have in obedience to their conscience done things which to-day fill us with regret and shame. Queen Mary sent the Protestants to the flames in obedience to what she conceived to be God's command, and she felt a sense of guilt that she had not carried out the command with greater thoroughness. Some of the most conscientious people in the world have been the most mistaken and have caused the greatest suffering, like those who organized the horrors of the Inquisition and the fires of Smithfield. They acted in ignorance. They did not know that it was never the Divine Will that men and women should be burnt or put to torture because they could not accept a certain creed. The idea of religious toleration had not then dawned upon the world. It was only after centuries of travail and pain that that great truth was unveiled to mankind and the tragedy is that until that day dawned the sensitive conscience was left to the mercy of a wrong idea, with terrible consequences to the world. It is just another proof that the revelation of God is a growing thing. First to one lonely soul then to another the idea comes, and probably the pioneers of the new truth have to suffer, but the light spreads gradually until the minds of men are ultimately suffused with the Divine illumination.

But does it not open up a big problem in Providence that the world should be so ordered that it is only after much pain and agony that men discover the truth that the will of God is to be found not in cruelty but in compassion, not in uniformity but in tolerance, not in despotism but in liberty?

I know we have to accept the Universe, as Carlyle said, but there are some things in it that are hard to understand. I never read the history of civilization and the story of man's ascent from darkness to light without a sense of wistful wonder that it has been necessary for him to suffer so much before he has been able to discover the real character and discern the real will of God. But this, I know, is only part of a bigger problem, and I am straying from my theme. Suffice it for the present to realize that the self-revelation of God in the Conscience, as in the intellect, has grown more clear with every century, and that behind all the movements of history there has been a Divine Power leading humanity upward towards the heights.

But, it may be said, good men *to-day* differ in their moral judgments; do not these contemporary variations affect the validity of the Divine Revelation? Well, good men never differ about the moral values themselves or on the fact of moral obligation. Good men never fail to recognize the infinite distinction between right and wrong, but they do differ sometimes as to what, in particular circumstances, is right and wrong. These are matters that men themselves have to find out very often by the use of the intellectual faculties that God has given them and by their own free and unprejudiced consideration. God's self-revelation in conscience is not meant to atrophy the intellect or relieve the will of its proper responsibility. God does not do our thinking for us. We have to exercise our own judgment and think a problem through to its appropriate issues. The feeling of Compassion, *e.g.*, is ultimate and final. It is the self-revelation of God in conscience, but how to translate that feeling into wise action, both in private life and public policy, may not be very clearly discernible. It is a point where good men's judgments may clash.

Moral values never vary, but we may attempt to reach them a
realize them by different ways. Our moral judgments are subject to
contingencies of time and place and various other factors. In this rea
we must not look for an *ex cathedra* pronouncement. The era of infa
bility has gone for ever. My conscience tells me that nations should l
in peace, that the ideal of peace is the only ideal consistent with the Divi
character and the Divine purpose for mankind, and that I must work f
peace with all the intellectual strength and with all the enthusiasm I c
command; but my conscience may not tell me to sign the Oxford Resol
tion implying that in no circumstances can it be right for anyone
take up arms. On the issue of pacifism good men's judgments may diffe
The self-revelation of God in conscience, therefore, does not prevent
and is not designed to prevent—a cleavage of opinion. We cannot tru
to any infallible pronouncement. We must just reach our conclusion
best we can in the light of all the facts of history, human nature, and co
temporary politics, always keeping our eyes on the ultimate goal and ou
feet on the upward track. There, conscience is a safe and infallible guide
We know the things that make for the welfare and happiness of min
We know that this is at bottom a moral universe, that there are mor
laws which cannot be broken with impunity and moral values which mus
at all costs be achieved.

In the end, the validity of the moral law and the moral ideal is prove
by the fact that it is only as our personal life and our national and inte
national life are governed by these principles that we can ever achie
stability and progress and peace.

The present condition of the world is a standing witness to the reali
of a moral order in the universe. What we are seeing to-day is simp
the result of the violation of moral laws. The present chaos is the inev
able debacle of a materialistic civilization, and we shall never reach a soc
order or a world peace until we frame our policy and our programme
harmony with the Will of God revealed in the soul of man.

I pass with great pleasure to

III—Its Religious Significance.

I say " with great pleasure ", because I am concerned to plead t
cause of those good and honest folk who feel that they are more or le
on the outside of religion because they cannot confess to any norm
evangelical experience.

Now it seems to me that in the experiences of the moral life we tou
the very heart of religion. It is the God revealed in conscience wi
Whom we have to do, the God Who speaks to us in terms of duty a
moral ideals and moral values. As Savonarola says in George Eliot
Romola, " The higher life begins for us, my daughter, when we renounc
our own will and bow before a Divine law ". It is here, then, in th
sphere of the conscience, not in the sphere of the intellect or the emotions
that a man's religious battles are really fought and won. It is here wher
to most men God is most clearly unveiled, where His voice is heard wit
most distinctness, and His presence felt with the greatest power. I am
speaking now of ordinary men, the plain folk (who are, of course, th
majority), men not endowed with the peculiarly religious temperament
who have " no genius for the Unseen ", who never have any cosmic emo
tions, who do not feel intellectually at home in the Pauline categories, an
who are not able to use sincerely the intense language of our Evangelica
hymns. I feel sometimes that we concentrate too much on a certain typ
of religious experience which apparently leaves the ordinary man cold

We couch our faith in terms and ideas which the plain man does not understand, and the result is that he feels he is an outsider, that he is not religious in the real sense, and he often leaves the Church alone. The Church has lost the point of contact and the avenue of approach. Otherwise I cannot understand why such numbers of really decent people, with high ideals of life and with a keen sense of duty, neglect our message and absent themselves from our fellowship, and so give point to the famous epigram of Archbishop Lang, " Religion attracts, the Church repels ".

One of our great needs to-day is to show how vitally religion does touch the ordinary life of men, how it is involved very deeply with the common task and the common road, how every man who is steadfastly following the light of conscience is a servant of the Most High, and every woman who lives a really sacrificial life is a disciple of Christ, for the love of God abides in her heart, and every lad who is pursuing, through toil and tumult, the high ideals of purity and chivalry and honour, is a true believer, though he may not belong to a Christian Church or even accept the orthodox Christian creed. They are all really in contact with the unseen world where the moral values which they love and cherish have their origin and their home. It is to them, perhaps, a strange force that urges them on, that shapes their course and determines their ideals and their decisions, but we Christians know that it is God, and we want to tell them that in rendering this allegiance they are really worshipping the Power Whose glory is the light of setting suns, but Whose greater glory is reflected in the light of noble souls.

Is it not true what Thomas Carlyle wrote to John Stuart Mill 100 years ago, "Whoever recognizes the infinite nature of Duty believes in God"? That is one debt we owe to Carlyle—his recognition of God not in the miraculous and the supernatural, but in the conscience and the soul of man. " Even in the darkest hour of intellectual bewilderment ", he writes in *Sartor Resartus,* " the infinite value of Duty was still present to me. Living without God in the world, of God's light I was not utterly bereft. If my as yet sealed eyes could nowhere see Him, nevertheless in my heart He was present and His Heaven-written law stood legible and sacred there ". I have spoken of our debt to Carlyle. But we must not fail to acknowledge our supreme debt to Kant. It was he who taught us that the great affirmations of religion are really based on the moral consciousness. He entrenched it securely in the consciences of men. Someone reminded us of that when the world was celebrating the bi-centenary of Kant, two or three years ago, and his words brought comfort and hope to, at any rate, one reader. " It is re-assuring ", he said, " to know that the most permanent spiritual force in the eighteenth century was not any happy warrior of the ideal or mystic rapt in unspeakable visions. No. He was a prosaic little professor, who manfully and honestly grappled with the intellectual problems of the time, holding fast to the clue which he found in the idea of duty. And when I contemplate this life, outwardly dull and undistinguished, I gain a profound conviction of the majesty of the human soul ". Yes, and the question I ask is this. Why should we be so insistent to differentiate between the religious consciousness and the moral consciousness? Are we not indulging in the fallacy of a false antithesis? When the moral consciousness is most sensitive, it takes on a mystic quality, it rises to the level of religion, it is translated into real spiritual experience. That is what we need to tell our people. To hunger and thirst for goodness, that is surely the sign of a religious soul. The ideal of goodness that haunts and woos our heart, that is our vision of the face of God. The dreams we cherish of a nobler, better world that call us to action, that is God challenging our loyalty. The stern impulse to duty,

that is God urging us on. The sense of remorse when we have d wrong, that, too, is God, God's judgment upon us, God's appeal to The sense of peace that follows when we have done our best, that is G God's benediction. These are the things we can tell our people. T highest manifestation of the good life is the highest expression of religi the blending of the will of man with the will of God. " Father, not will but thine be done ". Lord Haldane once used a happy phrase wh he was taking the chair at a dinner in honour of Prof. Einstein :—

> If at your command the straight lines have been banished from t Universe, there is one straight line which will always remain—t straight line of right and justice.

These are fine words, and that straight line leads us right into the hea of the Eternal. " God ", he said once, " is not outside us but within o breasts, ' an almighty and ever-present deity '. Our duty is to work f the ideals which alone can light up our paths ".

Was such a man not religious—in the true sense of that word—eve though he did not belong to any Church or profess any Christian creed

Whatever else religion is, it is at least this—loyalty to the highest tha we know, loyalty to the finest intuitions of our own conscience, loyalty t the light of the moral ideal that shines within the soul. So when people religious people, even Doctors of Divinity—set up an antithesis betwee morality and religion, I am spiritually bewildered. I feel it robs morali of its religious quality and robs religion of its ethical splendour.

> Where is your God ? they say :
> Answer them, Lord most Holy !
> Reveal Thy secret way
> Of visiting the lowly :
> Not wrapped in moving cloud,
> Or nightly-resting fire ;
> But veiled within the shroud
> Of silent high desire.

I know the revelation of God in conscience is limited and partial—but l us do nothing to diminish its value to mankind. Limited and partial as is, it still glows with the radiance of a divine illumination, and it speal with the certitude of a Divine Voice, sufficient to guide our steps and constrain our hearts to reverence and to prayer. One has only to rec the devotional literature of the *Old Testament* to realize to what heigh and depths the revelation of God in the conscience can affect the huma soul. *Ps.* 51 is a proof that the stricken conscience can ever discover th saving grace of God.

Any real revival of religion will always re-kindle and reinforce th Divine message written in the consciences of men. Is this not what th world needs most at the present crisis in her history—to be convinced tha this is a moral universe and that only in obedience to her laws can it finc the pathway to security, nobility, and peace?

THE SELF-REVELATION OF GOD IN INANIMATE MATTER.

By Mr. E. Cunningham, M.A.

I.

I cannot think of anything less animated than a stone. Eddington speaks of a table, but I think a stone seems more completely devoid of life. If you prefer it, take a piece of iron, or a drop of water. The poet seemed to anticipate our subject when he found "sermons in stones and books in the running brooks", and "God in everything". So let us look at a stone and see what we find in it. As it happens the simplest kind of stone is a precious stone, the diamond. Chemists can find in it but one single element, carbon, the commonest of elements. Here we have it in its purest form, as dead as anything in nature. What do we see in this diamond? It is hard, transparent, crystalline. It flashes in the sunlight. Because it is hard and transparent and can be highly polished, wears long and is not easy to come by, it is treasured as an ornament. It pleases the eye and is a pretty toy. There does not seem to be much sermon in that, save that the colours of the spectrum stir something within us that is an indefinable pleasure. Colour! What is that? Let us keep strictly to the inanimate, forgetting our personal emotions. We shall have to ask about this quality of dead matter to which the primitive savage responds. Emotion apart, what is colour? What is it in this colourless stone that turns the white rays of the sun into a rainbow?

They tell us that this light is a succession of waves travelling through space, beating on the stone with measured pulse like the waves of the ocean on the cliffs of Cornwall. But not great rollers of water which we count one by one every ten or five seconds. These waves arrive, millions of millions of them every second, and follow one another a million in an inch, more or less, according to the colour. Beating on the shores of the diamond they are scattered and separated and thrown back to us. How do you count them, you say? Well, honestly, we don't count them; but will you believe that no one doubts that this is a reasonable account of light and colour, that the difference between red and green is only a difference in the rapidity of succession of the waves, just as the difference between C and G on the piano is only a matter of a difference in the frequency of vibration of the waves set up in the atmosphere by the vibration of a wire? The waves cannot be counted one by one, but the wave-theory is the only reasonable interpretation of the breaking up of the light of the sun into a spectrum by our diamond, as it is of many other observed phenomena. This you will grant; but, you go on to ask, what is the ocean that fills space, in which the waves are formed and in which they travel? It is not air, for this ocean must fill space to the most distant stars from which light comes, and we know that the atmosphere does not do this. These light waves can travel through the great emptiness in which the planets swim and the stars have their courses. This ocean offers no resistance to the movements of these great stars, yet it can transmit these minute waves. The ether, we have called it. It cannot be felt, touched, described; it is nothingness save that it is the bearer of these waves; not air, nor earth, nor water, solid nor liquid—there is nothing that will tell us what it is like. That it carries the waves 186,000 miles in one second, that is all we can say of it. 186,000 miles a second! That number had a familiar ring to Clerk-Maxwell, and was the clue that led him to suspect the intimate connexion between light

and electricity, and gave rise to the guess that yet more waves might be wrought than this world had dreamt of. Now the electric waves are a commonplace. Waves in the ether succeed one another 1,000 metres apart, 300, 200, 50, 20, 1—follow the scale as you ascend the scale in music, waves following one another more and more closely. The radio waves merge into the heat waves, the heat waves into the light waves, the light waves into the ultra-violet. Shorten them still more and we reach by a continuous transition those X-rays which can reveal the contents of your purse without it being opened.

You will say I am forgetting about my diamond. I am coming back to it with the X-rays. Let a beam of these rays fall on the diamond. Something strange takes place, something quite different from that which happens to the light rays. We can catch the reflection of the beam on a photographic plate, and there appears a strange pattern, something completely unexpected. An explanation must be made, and here is the beginning of a new branch of science. For these patterns have been found to be explicable if the diamond consists of atoms in a regular array. Read the work of Sir William Bragg, and you will see that he feels himself completely familiar with the arrangement of these atoms; he measures their distance apart to the thousand-millionth part of a centimetre. Not directly, of course. What he measures is his photographic plate. The rest is interpretation. No man hath seen an atom at any time. No man has a rule by which he can measure a hundred-millionth of an inch. But that does not make the explanation less convincing. Everything fits together so beautifully. He can make a model on an enlarged scale showing how the atoms of carbon are arranged in the diamond, and he goes on to do the same for all sorts of other crystals.

But see how far we have gone already from our hard stone. We are talking gaily about ether and waves and atoms, all of which are products of our scientific imagination, all of them beyond our powers of vision, all unknowns. And yet that stone has become a far more wonderful object than the glittering ornament and the object of envy. It is the body within which are working the electrical forces which, following definite laws, are found everywhere in the universe. "A primrose by the river's brim, a yellow primrose was to him, and it was nothing more." So the plain man sees it. Even so he sees the diamond; a flash, a sparkle, a cutter of glass, nothing more. Just something taken for granted. But to the trained observer and to the mathematical mind it is not only much more than that intrinsically, it is not only an array of atoms holding one another fast in unbreakable array but, pulsing in harmony with the light of the sun, it is at one with the whole universe.

Let us, however, go one step further and ask more about these atoms and how they hold one another together. An atom of carbon is not a miniature diamond, any more than it is a miniature piece of coal or of graphite. Go down to the atom and you lose the properties of the crystal, you lose the transparency and the hardness, and you have something that requires an act of faith and imagination. It cannot now be pictured as a simple thing, a diminutive sphere of carbon. It is not as Dalton envisaged it a hundred years ago, ultimate and indivisible. How shall we picture it? Some kind of a nucleus with six electrons whirling round it, say Lord Rutherford and his followers. And what, pray, is this nucleus, what are electrons? Please do not ask of what these are made, how big they are and so on. Remember they are not objects of direct observation, no one has seen or measured one. The atom is an idea evolved by the scientist to co-ordinate his poor, sporadic, disconnected observations of the way things

behave. Nuclei and electrons are further ideas which he has conceived for the purpose of relating the behaviour of his imagined atoms. His carbon atom has six electrons whirling round, hydrogen one, oxygen eight. I wish I could tell the story by which the unrelated elements of Dalton have become so related to one another that the difference between the atom of carbon and the atom of gold is reduced to not much more than the difference between the number 6 and the number 79. There is an elementary something common to all the atoms—the proton, it is called; six of these somethings join together and you have the atom of carbon. Seventy-nine of them join together and you have the atom of gold; one more and you have an atom of mercury; 29 and you have copper; 26 iron. "How do you know?" is your insistent question. As far as I am concerned, it is hearsay. But it is the only satisfying interpretation of the work of thousands of scientists in all countries.

But what is going to be the end of this investigation? We ask "What is the ultimate nature of electricity?". We are told that it is a crowd of electrons. We ask "What is an electron or a proton?". There we are stopped at present. But if we go further, and we shall certainly do so, shall we be any further? We shall simply describe one idea in terms of another. If we have described all the atoms in terms of one or two more elementary ideas, are we nearer to or further from reality? At each step in the analysis we go further into the realm of imagination, further away from the immediate sensations which at first are to us the evidence of the reality of the universe. But we are not going further away from truth. Of that the scientist is convinced. For at every step as he proceeds the universe becomes more and more an inescapable and convincing reality. Instead of perceiving it with his physical senses only, by touch and sight and hearing, it enters into his thought with a conviction of rightness. As the stuff of which the universe seems to consist fades away, becomes completely intangible to the senses, the universe which the scientist sees becomes more certain, more full of unity and harmony, more accessible to the powers of thought.

This is the ultimate wonder of the inanimate universe, that as we feel slipping from our grasp one by one all those qualities which seemed essential, we are left holding the more firmly a universe that is richer and more unified, though one in which mathematical relations are the only assured residuum. But this residue is not the straw at which the drowning man clutches in his despair. Rather it is a sea that bears him up and in which he can swim with confidence, for it is his own medium.

II.

I have concentrated so far mainly on the advances made by physical science in the realms of the very small. But very great advances have been made in our knowledge of the large universe of the stars and the nebulæ. The numbers that are produced are very large, to some minds appalling. But the mathematician does not mind big numbers, so long as he can invent a shorthand way of writing them. And the world of the stars does not need such an act of imagination as the world within the atoms. It is *something* that we know more about the stars than we did, and can guess at something of their history and their size and inner nature. But we have ceased to be awed by big numbers and great distances and times, and we do not look that way for a revelation of the meaning of the universe. Doubtless at some time you have been puzzled about or rather terrified at the thought of infinity; of space stretching on beyond all thought, with no boundary, and of time unceasing and

with no beginning. There seem to be essential contradictions. It seems that there must have been a beginning, and yet you cannot help asking "Well, if there was a beginning to the universe, what was there before that?". In this thought of the mystery of infinity some people have found their God. The ancient Hebrews did not worry about this, but bowed before the mystery of that which was very much bigger than themselves. Big numbers awed them. Great distances spoke of the divine. But not so with us. We have learned so much of the art of measuring. Besides, we have learned what philosophers have often suspected, that space and time are not what Newton led us all into thinking.

And here I must venture to say a few words about what I may call the "relativity episode". When Newton began to write up the results of all his thinking about the celestial movements he found himself compelled to begin with two postulates which, although fundamental to his methods, nobody as a matter of fact ever at heart accepted. "Absolute space, in itself, and without regard to any other things, remains for ever fixed and immovable". Absolute space—the emptiness in which everything moves—to be thought of by itself, for ever fixed and immovable. And again, "Absolute time, by itself, and without regard to anything else, flows on for ever uniformly". You might try to imagine this absolute time which is to be the standard by which all time is measured, the standard to which all clocks conform, but which is to be thought of without regard to any other things. If these vast emptinesses had reality, there would be a cold austere infinity outside ourselves that we could fear. But philosophers always criticized these postulates. On the face of them, they seem absurd. At any rate they were creatures of the imagination. For the only time we know is that given us by the motions of the heavenly bodies and their relations with our own consciousness. And the only space we know is given us by the relations between ourselves and the objects we know by our senses. To speak of space and time as Newton did is therefore a most daring act of abstraction. Space and time would be all that would be left of the universe after you had taken everything out of it.

This background of absolute time and space was justified by the fact that, using it, Newton was able to give an astonishingly effective and simple account of the motions of celestial bodies. Most astonishing it was, not only in its immediate, but in its subsequent, success up to the crowning work of John Couch Adams and Leverrier in predicting the existence of the planet Neptune. But the objections remained and grew until in the beginning of this century Einstein set to work to re-think the whole matter, to ask whether these absurd conceptions of absolute time and space were really necessary. Was it possible, he asked himself, to describe the relations between physical happenings without making these illogical assumptions?

Fortunately he found waiting the mathematical analysis which he needed. Forty years earlier a mathematical genius who died young—Bernhard Riemann—had written a short paper which supplied the necessary ideas and the germs of the necessary calculations. With the help of these Einstein was soon able to announce the success of his efforts. Starting with the desire to satisfy the philosophical objectors to Newton's absolute time and space, he had discovered that in discarding these illogical abstractions he could formulate a mathematical scheme which would do all that Newton's did. But it could do more; it corrected Newton's scheme at the only point where this had proved incapable of explaining astronomical observations. It also predicted two hitherto unsuspected phenomena—and these were soon found to exist!

I am not going to try to explain more about relativity. I have long since given up trying to do so, because it is essentially a mathematical

theory. I would only say this, that I cannot think of any more convincing illustration of the essential harmony of the universe and the thinking mind. Out of all the mathematical formulæ that might be invented Einstein chooses one to which he feels there can be no philosophical objection, one which makes a minimum of assumptions. On the face of it, this formula would appear capable of proving nothing. But, proceeding by straightforward calculations, out of it emerge all the relations that Newton had given us and more : all except those illogical absolutes. These are proved to be as unnecessary as they are unsatisfactory.

The result was a very great liberation of thought; and a very great access of confidence to the mathematical physicist. He could now dare to trust his intuitions. Up to now there had been a conflict. These Newtonian mechanical categories of space, time, mass, force, and the primary fact of hard matter he had hitherto had to square with mathematical law. There had seemed to be two primary elements in nature, matter and law. The laws he had to find out as it were by groping and knocking his head against hard matter. There were two mysteries, the existence of matter and its obedience to law. Of the two matter had seemed the more insistent and unavoidable. The laws which it obeyed, which governed its motions, could only be attributed to unseen material mechanisms. Indeed, the whole universe seemed to be a mechanism, a large machine grinding out inescapable facts. God was the master mechanic; His laws were the working of a machine.

But in this new outlook to which the success of the theory of relativity gave the primary stimulus all this mechanism and scaffolding was lost. All the observable facts were wrapped up in a formula for which the initial preference was purely æsthetic and philosophical. At the same time all our material categories, substance, things, causation, were found to be merely expressions in various aspects of the more fundamental mathematical relations which the mind was able to conceive. Not matter, but law, became the prime reality.

And thus whether we go outward into the very great, or inwards into the very small, we find that our knowledge of the universe is a knowledge of mathematical relations. We cannot speak of that which underlies these relations. We cannot speak of the cause of these relations. Matter, stuff, things, are only names which we give to summarize whole complexes of such relations. This is emphasized by Eddington in the very opening of his book, *The Nature of the Physical Universe*. If you ask what a table is, you can describe it in terms of your relations to it as a whole, its functions, its permanence, its utility, its reliability for the purposes to which you put it—or, if you ask what it is in itself, you go along the long train of analysis into atoms and electrons and the unknown beyond, and there is nothing left but mathematical equations. They are the only things that we truly know in physical science. And here we note that *the reality of matter and things for us consists in the abiding value of those equations, and in the fact that they are what Bishop Barnes calls "public knowledge". We can agree* on these relations. Each scientist does not have his private set of equations. They are arrived at by co-operative effort, and only by general agreement can they be accepted as final. The possibility, the actuality, of general agreement constitutes the nature of reality in this realm.

III.

Having said thus much about the change in the scientific outlook on the universe I would like to point out that we are coming back to an attitude that was familiar in ancient times. As an illustration, here is a passage

from *The Testament of Beauty* by Robert Bridges, who knows more abou Greek thought than I do :

> . . . . and surely Reason's property wil be
> the idea of Order ; . . .
> for since all natur is order'd (nor none will deny
> that 'tis by Reason alone we are of such order aware),
> all things must of their ordinance come in her court
> for judgment ; and 'twas thus Pythagoras coud hold
> NUMBER to be the universal essence of things :
> nay, see the starry atoms in the seed-plot of heaven
> stripp'd to their nakedness are nothing but Number.

The present-day view could hardly be better described. The starry atoms in the seed-plot of heaven—and to these we may now add the whole complex of chemical phenomena, the structure of matter, the electrons and protons which we picture as going to make an atom, the waves that we picture to form light, and the light-quanta into which these are now resolved, energy, inertia, space, time, and all the other physical categories that the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries have invented—stripped to their nakedness are nothing but number.

This is not now an imaginative account of things; it is the bare fact. In Cambridge we have a very distinguished young professor whom I have known from his first day in Cambridge. He came here from an engineering course, his mind filled with machines and mechanics. He learned from me among others what Lorentz and Larmor had said about electrons—how matter had been resolved into electrons acting on one another through the ether, how Sir Joseph Larmor pictured an electron as a mere kink in the ether, and the workings of the universe as an expression of the abstract principle of least action. And then he went on to consider how Einstein went one better and finally made the ether itself unknowable and, worse still, made the firm background of space and time into something far less secure. That shattering remark of Minkowski's, so often quoted, "from henceforth space by itself and time by itself are mere shadows, only a kind of blend of the two properly exists" is set over against Newton's solid postulates, on which our forefathers built their solid structure of mechanical theory and timed the planets in their motion, foretold eclipses to a second a hundred years in advance and told the astronomers to look for the undiscovered planet to find it just so. Our young physicist sheds all these things quite gaily, and more too. The electron, once a point, becomes vague; when he cares to he calls it a particle, at other times a train of waves. And now when you ask the professor what he means by wave-mechanics, waves of probability, waves that behave like particles and particles that behave like waves—all he will say is just numbers, functions. What is a wave? I suppose he would say it is all that is left of a certain curve when you take away the paper it is drawn on and the space in which that paper exists.

That is how these young physicists have been treating us, taking away one by one all the pictures we have ever formed of nature's inner workings and leaving us with abstract mathematics. It seems to us strange that such iconoclasm (truly an appropriate word for this breaking down of images) should be an enrichment to knowledge, that a doctrine of relativity and a denial of the old ideas of space and time, and later the scientific rendering of the old saying, "You don't know where you are", the principle of uncertainty, should be an adequate foundation for an explanation of certain surprising pictures obtained on a photographic plate, that out of negatives positives should come. It seems like a reversal of the dictum, "Out of nothing, nothing comes". But so it has been, and we who cannot breathe

this purer air are left gasping for firmer ground and lower altitudes and more solid tables.

And yet I think the point of view is not too difficult faintly to imagine. Here are a few different expressions of it. Wordsworth came to my College, was not a very diligent student, but, like a good poet, was able to imagine things.

> Yet may we not entirely overlook
> The pleasure gathered from the rudiments
> Of geometric science. Though advanced
> In these enquiries, with regret I speak,
> No farther than the threshold, there I found
> Both elevation and composed delight:
> With Indian awe and wonder, ignorance pleased
> With its own struggles, did I meditate
> On the relation those abstractions bear
> To Nature's laws, and by what process led,
> Those immaterial agents bowed their heads
> Duly to serve the mind of earth-born man;
> From star to star, from kindred sphere to sphere,
> From system on to system without end.

That is the poet's glimpse, a hundred years before its time, of the doctrine which is now becoming a commonplace in physical science; and he goes on, anticipating the closing part of my paper:

> More frequently from the same source I drew
> A pleasure quiet and profound, a sense
> Of permanent and universal sway,
> And paramount belief; there, recognized
> A type, for finite natures, of the one
> Supreme Existence, the surpassing life
> Which—to the boundaries of space and time,
> Of melancholy space and doleful time,
> Superior, and incapable of change,
> Nor touched by welterings of passion—is,
> And hath the name of, God.

And now some will be saying that we have come round full-circle to the idealistic position of Berkeley. But at least we must go with Barnes in what he calls his moderate realism, admitting that public and common knowledge compels us to think of the universe as existing apart from the particular minds of individuals in the ordinary sense. But if the statement is qualified or explained by saying that the universe can only exist in a universal mind, or in the thought of an ever-present being, this is an unjustifiable extrapolation or stretching of words. At least such a universal mind would be completely different from the limited finite minds which function within these temporary bodies of ours. It is worth while for us to try to state clearly, without stretching the meanings of words beyond their common usage, and recognizing the deficiencies of language, the position to which we have arrived.

We may confirm Locke's assertion that the essence of substances is for ever unknowable. We may assert that we see no limit yet to the capacity of our minds to link phenomena together in chains of mathematical relations, and that we are not unreasonable in supposing these relations are in the nature of the universe which includes our conscious selves.

IV.

There arises now, however, a point of real importance. So far we have not noted particularly that mathematics is a product of conscious mind and is associated with cerebral activity and physical processes. Our personal

powers to take the Mathematical Tripos are limited to a few years and will soon decay as physical changes take place in the brain. Then thought, as we know it, may cease. What is the connexion between this physical universe as we have been trying to envisage it, and the workings of the mind? Our bodies are composed of those same elements which we find in the diamond and the running brook. The biochemist talks gaily about metabolism in which chemical combinations of atoms go to the building up of the body. In the physiological laboratory the student counts up the units of energy used, and strikes a balance between that and the energy taken in in converting food into tissue. The radiologist examines the effect of X-rays and ultra-violet light on the formation of tissue. In all the newer physiology the results of physics and chemistry have to be admitted. The body is an organization of atoms. But, in our view, each atom, stripped to its nakedness, is nothing but number. Your physical body is but the gross outward show. It is not the reality. The real essence of it is for ever unknowable. Our conscious thought is the connecting link between that complex of relations which is the body as we know it and the power to know which abides in us. We cannot but ask afresh, "What are we?".

Does this seem a logical scheme with which to answer this question?

> Once there was inanimate matter.
> One day matter came alive.
> By a process of evolution man developed from primitive organisms.
> Thought was born.
> Mathematics then was invented when the brain was complex enough.

As long as matter was a primal category this may have been a possible scheme. In the extreme form of it thought was a last product of materialist evolution. But if our analysis be correct, the essence of thought must have been there inherent in matter even before there was conscious thinking at all. This seems to overturn materialist thinking, and the development of the material world looks more like the fundamental thought-principle gradually building for itself a body. The brain and the body look like the outer clothing of the thought, and not its origin.

Physical science is saying this to-day with no uncertain voice—and again it is an old voice, the voice of one of the greatest of mathematicians, Descartes: *Cogito, ergo sum.* Thought, not mechanism, reason, not stuff, spirit, not body, is essential in our personality. It is in these that we are nearer to the heart and the meaning of ourselves and of the universe.

Now the pure mathematician has in a great degree contrived to separate thought from matter, and is doing so more and more; and the metaphysicians are joining him. Symbolic logic, the manipulation of abstract propositions without reference to anything in particular, is the characteristic of the purest of pure mathematics. "The pure mathematician is only really happy when he does not know what he is talking about", said Bertrand Russell some time ago, when he was a mathematician; and that becomes increasingly so as the years go by. He plays with the things of his own invention. He needs no laboratory. He needs, in fact, to liberate himself from all promptings from material objects and to follow the inescapable laws of his thought. He is at home in a different world,

> In verity, an independent world, created out of pure intelligence.

But Wordsworth had not seen so far as we have seen to-day. For it is not indeed an independent world, this world of pure mathematics. This clear synthesis, built up aloft so gracefully, is not a mere plaything, a toy to sense embodied. It is now made plain to us that it is at the heart of our very existence. It is a principle which gives coherence to our existence and

makes it possible. It is not a world independent of the real world, but it is one certain quality of that real world which alone we can know. And thus it is not only our own self that is revealed in this act of pure mathematics, but it is our whole universe of things and related selves.

You will say, But surely mathematics cannot be independent of cerebral activity? To some extent that is a matter of definition. But, as I asked you a little while ago, "What are you? When did you begin to live?". Not when you began to be conscious or to develop that memory which is such a large part of consciousness. That self which is you grew into consciousness; without your conscious aid the mathematical laws were obeyed by which your bones and your brain grew, and one day these will fail again and consciousness will retire again. Your power to take the Mathematical Tripos will fail, but you will throughout, in your unconscious more than in your conscious activity, conform to these strange rules of number which for a very few years you are able to associate with strange marks upon paper. And yet you cannot resist the conviction that in the highest stage of those conscious years your conscious thinking must be in tune with the activity of the whole. That is the scientist's faith—that while he does not know all, yet the mind is a safe guide and will not lead to a meaningless morass, the universe is ultimately one with himself, and its character is allied to the character of his own thinking. As Jeans puts it bluntly: " The Universe now appears as a great thought".

V.

And now—what about God? So far I have avoided the use of the word. Strictly speaking, the scientist, in his professional capacity, cannot talk about God. He only gives a name to an object of perception or to a concept abstracted from perception. What do we mean when we use the name? Suppose that we try to formulate what would be meant by the name in the light of our previous talk about the inanimate universe. The universe—so it appears—is, in the only certain reality of it, a body of thought. It is real in the sense that we can all agree upon the content of this body of thought; it is independent of our own caprice and fancy. It is unbounded. But the existence of it all is a perpetual mystery. It is a mysterious combination of assured knowledge and complete ignorance. Here our powers end, reverence and awe remain. Wordsworth hits it off well. He frankly gives the name of God to the unknown, undefinable reality which is felt in the presence of this boundary between knowledge and ignorance. He had not been so thoroughly soaked in the materialistic and mechanistic conceptions of a completely known universe which resulted in confident speech about a Maker of it all. And he therefore escaped the false dilemma, founded in mechanistic thought, that either there is a God who made the universe and keeps it in order, or else all is pure chance. Either of these alternatives assumes a mechanistic universe, but they give different names to the regulative principle that governs the movements of matter. But Wordsworth frankly says: The greatness of our knowledge compels reverence and gives security; the greatness of our ignorance compels trust. Is it not these that we think of when we use the name of God? That name connotes the unknown, but though we are in the presence of mystery we may rest in peace.

But here crops up the old question, "Is God personal?". Some of us are a little fearful lest we have blasphemous thoughts. Our past training suggests to us that there may be something wrong in us if we cannot think of God as a person made in our own image. We think that to dissociate the idea of personality from the qualities of will and purpose which are

characteristic of our conscious lives is to be irreverent. Now physical science is not so apt to be dishonest as philosophy or theology, for it has no bias, no ethical motive save that of asking what is the most satisfactory way of looking at things so that they come in tune with one another and satisfy our logical faculty. And I have tried to show that within the realm of inanimate nature the one satisfying principle is the mathematical principle, the logical principle shown most clearly in pure mathematics. We shall not all be prepared to take Jeans's next step and say that from this point of view the Creator of the universe is best conceived as a mathematician. For that seems to start an endless chain. Which came first, mathematics or the mathematician? We cannot answer. There is a stage at which thought stops. As I face this stop there come to my mind familiar words : "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God". Paraphrase it. "In the beginning was, or behind all things is—not mathematics, that suggests too much—the whole germ of mathematics and a universe flowering upon the tree that sprang thence. In the beginning was—not number, that is too earthly a word. In the beginning was—what?—the Word—and that Word was with God, and that Word was God. Language must fail, yet we cannot but try to use it as we get back to the ultimate mysteries. Try how we may, this mathematics of ours runs through the heart of things and is, more than anything in the physical world, the ultimate mystery. If what I have been saying is right the essence of personality is far beyond our seeming conscious bodies. To it belongs this mysterious mathematical quality, but to it do not belong two eyes, two ears, a nose, and a mouth, or any of those phases of consciousness associated with a spirit clothed upon with a body. God can only be personal with that kind of personality which is independent of a body that is transient and evanescent. Our conscious thinking is a shadow of something more fundamental, something which eludes us as long as we are chasing the shadows. But as we pursue this mathematical truth we are in contact, as I quoted from Wordsworth, with the type, for finite natures, of that one Supreme Existence which is supernatural in the true sense; not, that is, which can stop a machine and reverse it if it will, but which, inherent in the meaning of nature, is superior to all natural classifications.

VI.

And now to draw to an end. I want to say that this surely is not the last word. Must we not ask ourselves sincerely whether the road that we have been travelling is not parallel to other paths into the great secrets and the great certainties? This is not strictly my subject, and yet it is relevant. I have tried to show in what sense I find a reverent and true thought in thinking of God as a pure mathematician. But that is not all that we can say.

What about a musician? What about a poet, or an artist of any kind? Is there not the road of beauty—a road on which the mind is not the only guide, along which perhaps many more may travel than will face the cold hard road of logic and number? And we may even say that the sense of beauty includes the sense of truth. I struggled all one summer to write a paper on *The Testament of Beauty,* and well it repaid me. I would commend it to you to struggle with, for it will often bring you near to thoughts that are true and to glimpses of beauty. This is the burden of it, that through Beauty we come at wisdom and at the heart of the universe. In a very real sense mathematics is to me the beauty of the universe, the music of the spheres.

Nor is that all. For there is yet another road that one may travel towards the inner mysteries. If our mental processes and our artistic processes may speak to us of what lies beneath, so too may those movements towards one another which are at the basis of all our life as social beings. We are members one of another, this is not to be denied, and in the fullest experience of our conscious life together, in all the problems of love and hate, of good and evil, we are gaining intimations of what lies behind. And as in our physical science we seek the hidden unity behind the clash of matter, so we ask what is at the heart of the complexities of life. We seek some principle that gives meaning to them, something that is permanent and invulnerable and undeniable amid much that perplexes, something that is stronger than death, something ultimate and worthy to be called eternal. That is what those of us who call ourselves Christians see—though it be but faintly—as we think of Him we call Lord. He has given to the world the vision that "God is Love". I would put this alongside of the other phrase, "God is a pure mathematician". Putting aside all sentiment, we have to tackle that Christian dogma as frankly and honestly and with as much effort as we tackle natural science. Christ's illumination of the meaning of the universe needs as much hard work, careful method, exact thinking, and imaginative vision, as that of Newton or Einstein or our modern physicists. There is plenty of practical and theoretical work to be done along this line. And I ask you to say to yourself, Would Jesus Himself, supposing one of His calibre to be here among us to-day, be shocked at all this sort of talk, or would He Himself give a lead along these various road to—may I say it?—God?

THE SELF-REVELATION OF GOD IN ANIMATE NATURE.

By Dr. B. Lee Woolf.

First, a few preliminary remarks by way of axioms basic to our discussion.

(1) The revelation of God in animate nature must not be expected to be the equivalent of the full knowledge of God which we possess from other sources. It may be a true self-revelation and still fall short of a complete revelation. But however short it may fall, it will be harmonious with what we know otherwise, and in no respect contradictory.

(2) Biologically the concept of animate nature includes man; animate nature, indeed, does not give its full meaning apart from the consideration of man in the biological sense. This consideration is developed much more fully in other papers, but it has its place in our present study.

We may now enter upon the first principle in considering the self-revelation of God in nature as a whole. It is that we know the craftsman from the craftsmanship. It was a saying of Carlyle's that "a dishonest man could not build a house", and certainly it is the case that the house which a builder erects enables us to understand a good deal of his mind, his intelligence, his skill, his honesty, and his concern for the people who are to live there.

Similarly, in far-off days the psalmist sang "The heavens declare the glory of God", and William Herschel, 150 years ago, in the same way said that one could not be an astronomer without being devout. There is an intimation of both the workmanship and the presence of God that comes to us from the survey of the heavens, and which has been perceived from

the days of the ancient Aryan invaders of India up to the present tim Jesus Himself made little appeal to physical phenomena as such; but h found much of the character of God revealed in the habits of sparrows a in the growth of the lilies of the field.

Such a principle warrants the moving of our thought in two direction From what we observe in the qualities of living things round about us w may deduce that God possesses either the same or complementary qualitie Thus, if we can see beauty in nature at all, in the trees of the forest or th grass of the meadow, we may infer that there is some quality of beauty God Himself. Again, if we observe in the crows of which St. Luke speak a way of life which suggests trust in providence, the inference is not ver far removed that we may find in God a care and a trustworthiness upo which they depend.

Of course it will be understood that any characteristics which we thu infer to be present in the Godhead can be distinguished from one anothe only for logical purposes. All the characteristics are interdependent, an may be all operative in any direction of which we may be thinking, al though our thought deals at the moment predominantly with only one.

It might be as well if, at this point, we lay down what qualities o the Godhead we should expect to find adumbrated in animate nature, an which show something of His personal character. The main qualities ar (a) majesty, (b) intelligence, (c) purpose, (d) goodness, and (e) holiness. would subdivide goodness into (i) care or providence, (ii) trustworthines and (iii) altruism, which is closely connected with forgiveness.

(a) In considering the self-revelation of the *Majesty* of God one mu admit that physical science is at the moment at an immense advantage, f this science has brought home impressively to our attention the vastnes the order, the uniformity, and the certainty of the universe and all its work It produces upon us a sense of awe, wonder, and beauty, and it turns o minds like that of the Psalmist immediately, and almost in spite of ther selves, towards the contemplation of the majesty of the Creator.

In animate nature the parallels of this impressiveness are not so pr minently in our minds at the present time; it requires, as a consequenc some effort of thought for us to appreciate the overaweing majesty of th system of animate nature as such. This is perhaps most easily perceiv in the colossal stretches of time which have been occupied by the evolutio of life upon the earth, from its lowliest beginnings in the amœba of th primeval slime to the complex and wonderful creatures which we find the fields, the forest, the jungle, and the city.

The history of mankind is, as has often been emphasized recently, b as the single tick of a clock which has been running for centuries. Real equally impressive with the vast stretches of space of which physical scienc speaks is this almost unplumbable depth of time which the whole proces has taken, and which is really quite unimaginable, and, therefore, unable to produce upon us the sense of greatness which a survey of physical nature produces.

But the marvel and majesty of the whole system of animate nature is to be found plainly revealed in other things than the long stretch of time which the process of evolution has occupied. If we can only grasp the significance of the fact that in a forest there are no two leaves alike; that, in all the myriads of insects which people the earth, no one is the exact copy of another; if we can only feel that every living thing from the minutest diatom of the ocean bed to the noblest man who has led his fellows into the highest reaches of human thought, if we can only imagine, I say, that each one has an independent entity, with a life, a purpose, a function all

of its own, each acted upon by, and reacting to, the whole of both the animate and insensate universe, we begin to feel something of the marvel and majesty of the whole system of life, and something of the astonishing splendour of the mind of God which is to be found in the least no less than in the greatest, and which is nowhere inoperative.

These hints of the majesty of God which only require that we should bend our minds to their contemplation, and give ourselves time to let their meaning assume their full proportions, are, however, filled out yet further when we notice, along with the greatness and multiplicity of it all, that there is an element of beauty present in each living thing, which comes out the more plainly the more closely we are able to observe them.

Emerson observed eighty years ago that "the microscope has yet to be made which can discover a thing less perfect for being small". Our microscopes and other means of observation have been wonderfully improved since Emerson's time, but it can still be averred that there is no exception to his remark. Beauty and care are to be found in every creature; there is a perfection of beauty, indeed, which we may seem only just now to be beginning to appreciate. Our best microscopes are tested, not by some artificial machine-like means contrived by the hands of ingenious men, but by the definition with which they enable us to see the outline of the diatomaceous ooze drawn up from the thousands of feet beneath the surface of the ocean. There is beauty hidden even in the primeval, which only our highest skill can enable us to see. Indeed, the beauty of nature found on every hand in myriad forms of structure and colour, and in the combination of movement, function, and instinct, is one of the most astonishing features known to the mind of man, and cannot but impress him who is willing to spend a few moments in quiet observation with the marvel and majesty of the mind whose craftsmanship they are.

(b) *Intelligence*. I dislike the use of this term in this connexion, but the quality I have in mind is that which in us would mean gifts of understanding, and also of practical genius of the highest order.

This vast and complex universe, vast and complex both on the physical and on the biological sides, reveals the quality of the controlling mind as over against the conception of a universe whose complexity is characterized chiefly by a fortuitous, and perhaps mostly fortunate, concourse of events for which no cause can be traced, either as a whole, or in detail, for which there is no discernible purpose, and which might as well have been other than it is.

One cannot help but be impressed, in the survey of animate nature as a whole, by the extraordinary ingeniousness or intelligence with which each organism is related to function, function to environment, and the whole to each of its constituent parts.

G. K. Chesterton remarked many years ago that if only one elephant had a trunk we might think it was a joke, but since all elephants have trunks, it looks like a plot. Particularly does this look like a plot when we observe the correlation between the function of the elephant's trunk and the life and circumstances of the elephant. This sense is still more increased if we trace the evolution of elephants through the series of their fossils, which are known in fair completeness. The very development of the structure of elephants from the time when their maximum size was less than that of a sheep-dog looks like the achievement of an intelligent artificer moulding his material to suit the changing environment ever more perfectly. More and more do we feel that "evolution by natural selection" fails to tell the whole story. Rather it bears evidence also to the intervention of a

personal intelligent guidance. After all, the fact of a plot implies t existence of a plotter.

This kind of observation, however, is one which perhaps may developed more fully in another connexion. More in place under t present heading is our observation of the way in which a few prima elements of life, and a few of their primary qualities, are capable of almost innumerable variety of application. Einstein speaks with truth the grand simplicity of the theory of Relativity. I confess it is a simplici which is very far removed from my own mind. But there is to be observ in animate nature a simplicity of ground-structure and function which ru throughout the whole in a way which would seem to be impossible unle one could posit the very highest intelligence acting both upon ea individual element and upon the system as a whole.

The amœba is the lowest form of life which has yet come under ou direct observation. But there is no process found in the amœba itse which is not also to be found in the cells of the more complex creature, an probably in every part of our living body. The amœba is able to contra its form and alter its shape apparently by precisely the same process a that by which we ourselves are able to contract and so alter the shape o our muscular fibres. The response of an amœba to its environment o light or darkness, heat or cold, dryness or moisture, its intake of food an excretion of waste, are all of them to be found in the same or close analogous forms, identical in principle throughout the realm of livin things.

The simplicity of the primary creature is built up into the most compl of living things, and its primal functions are essential to every member the evolutionary series; nay more, though countless ages have pass since first life dawned on the amœba and while myriads of forms of creatur have subsequently been developed, the actual amœboid form of life is st essential to our own life and health. There are something in the regi of 10,000 amœboid organisms in every drop of our blood, and were th not present we should droop and die. On occasion, their comparati fewness is the cause of some of the most refractory ills from which suffer, and their proper activity is our first line of defence against continu attacks of malign and microscopic diseases.

Surely a simplicity carried through the whole scheme of things, a sim plicity which we could never have dreamed of in the beginning, but whi cannot escape our observation when we survey the whole, is a most impre sive witness to the mental character of the Creator of it all.

This observation might be multiplied manifold were we to take in consideration the structure of the nucleus of each individual cell with t function and characteristics of its chromosomes and the amazing qualiti of its genes. The study of such matters has been in the forefront of th attention of our biologists for about a quarter of a century, and only jus now are they able to tell us of their extraordinary significance in th development of the individual and in the evolution of animate nature as whole.

(c) Perhaps it is the sense of a *purpose* behind things which comes hom to us most plainly and most often from a consideration of animate nature Those who have made long and detailed study of the germination of singl cells, *e.g.*, those of a frog or chicken, tell of a strange sense of direction o purpose in the actual development which takes place. Up to a certain stage it is possible to destroy a quarter or even half of the germ-cell with out in any way affecting the ultimate completion, and perfection of detail of the adult creature. At later stages, portions of the developing blastoi

can be removed from one part to another and engrafted successfully, when they will develop in the form, and function in the manner, which would have been the case if they had been undisturbed.

This produces upon the mind at first a sense akin to that of determinism, but multitudinous experiments tend to give scientists a sense, not of the mechanical operation of accidental forces so much as of a purpose that is willed, an end that is chosen, or of a whole or an entirety which must somehow be achieved. In other words, the process, by its surprising firmness, postulates freedom or determination rather than mechanism and determinism.

Physiological processes illustrate the same point. If I had the knowledge and ability of J. S. Haldane, I could illustrate it abundantly, but circumstances being what they are, I cannot do better than quote him:

> We can form no mechanical conception of why it is that the respiratory centre responds, and continues to respond, with such amazing delicacy to minute changes in a certain definite hydrogen pressure. Calculation from our actual experiments on man shows that a deficiency in ionized hydrogen of one part by weight in about one million parts of arterial blood is sufficient to suspend completely the activity of the respiratory centre, although, owing to cell-walls being only partially permeable to certain substances, the reaction of the blood sometimes does not communicate itself fully to the respiratory centre and other parts.
>
> All that we can say from a mechanical or physico-chemical standpoint as to this and other responses of equal delicacy, is that various parts of the body respond, and often with the most amazing delicacy and constancy, to slight changes in their "normal" environment.

In the course of his argument he develops the thesis that what is almost impossible to understand from a mechanical standpoint is immediately clear if one posits an intelligent, purposive control of the process.

I pass on to a further point. In the progressive nature of the evolutionary series, which is, on the whole, from the simple to the complex, yet it is not a mere multiplication of simplicities which by combinations and permutations more or less of a mathematical character reach a maximum of complexity. Our progress seems to take the line from the simple towards an *optimum* of complexity, from which *optimum* a further *optimum* can, in process of time, be developed.

The physical frame of man illustrates this fact more completely than that of almost any other creature. For man's hand, to take a common example, is less specialized than either the forelimb of a horse or the flipper of a whale, and it is on account of the lesser degree of specialization that the hand has proved to be the tool of the higher development of the race. What can be said of the hand of man can also be said of the foot, the eye, the ear, and even the skin, not to mention internal organs.

There is an *optimum*, which is neither the mathematically simple, nor the mathematically complex, but something intermediate, and, therefore, logically indeterminate which is capable of reacting, if not actually creating, a larger and a finer set of circumstances. This seems to indicate not a mechanical series of pre-ordained forces so much as the intelligent control and the definite purpose of a creative mind.

We now approach my next point. The world of living things is essentially creative. This essential character is found both on the physical, and also on the mental side. It is the very opposite of mechanical reproduction of a type, like buttons from a button mould, or screws from a screw-making machine. Each newly-born creature is in itself absolutely individual. In the last analysis, it must be dealt with for itself and for

itself alone, for there is not another quite like it. We have here a n creation.

But again one finds in living things a general power of constructivene which is the very opposite of the entropy everywhere in the physical u verse. The entropy of a heat-death, of which Sir James Jeans and oth physicists so often speak, could take place, of course, in the entire absen of an ultimate purpose, just as a clock will run down after it has be wound up for the last time before the sudden death of its owner.

But the creativeness of animate nature implies the opposite. It is n a mere accumulation of events, but a power of construction, a calling fort *ex nihilo*. The form which a creature possesses, and the life which it lives cannot be understood save from the postulate of an intelligent purpo operative through the whole of animate nature, and in every individua The process by which the bodies of both animals and plants are built up b feeding upon relatively simple materials is a further illustration. One ma ask how else is it that food is more than a mere fuel for a physical machine It is also something which, just because we are able to call it food, is dis tinct from fuel, and is finally, in part at least, translated into terms o mental energy. Dr. Campbell Macfie says:

> If the mutton and potatoes Shakespeare ate were built up in his cerebra cells in such chemico-dynamic form as to produce a mind and a Hamlet, hardly think we can explain such marvellous architectural consequence unless we postulate a master builder.

Now I come to the most important point. Everyone is impressed wit the problem of pain and suffering. Pain is of the greatest importance i living things. We are familiar with the view that it is the signal of ma adjustment. The unpleasantness of pain is, indeed, integral to its sal tary character; if it were pleasant, then there would be no desire for i or any living thing to put right what is wrong. Its very painfulness an imperative compelling us to react in a manner that, if successful, w permit the prime purpose to be defeated, *i.e.*, the reaction is teleologica

But consider this matter from another angle. I would suggest th pain is the first form of the translation from a bio-chemical phenomen to a mental operation; it is the simplest case of which we hav any acquaintance where a physical change makes manifest a sensibili which is of a non-physical character. It may well be that we have he the germinal point in the development of the whole range of ment activities of which we have any acquaintance at all—human, animal, even those noticeable in certain kinds of plants. Whether this be so no, it seems to me that pain is germane to the understanding of biolog as a whole; pain can be understood at once on the hypothesis of biologic teleology. Pain means reaction; it means that a reaction is demande from a creature to the stimulus of an outside world; it means, therefore that the creature itself is actually put into contact with a larger world thar it would be otherwise. The essential inertia and stability of its mechanica structure or chemical composition are overcome, as it were, by an effor from within, induced by the stimulus of pain. Every such reaction means contact with a larger world, which itself demands an altered individual in adjustment with it.

Tracing this line of thought a little further, one can see how easily we can get differentiated reactions to pressure, to sounds, to chemical constituents, and to the action of light. No doubt these reactions at first are of a protective character, and, from the point of view of the individual alone, self-protection is the end that is sought. And yet, in every case, something beyond self-protection is achieved. The simplest forms of self-

protection are found in the development of the different kinds of integument amongst the infusorians, which perhaps reach their apotheosis in the shells of snails, and in the armour-plate of crabs and beetles. Here again we get a perfection which passes the *optimum*. The *optimum* is something between complete protection and complete defencelessness which we find at its minimum in the creatures which consist of naked protoplasm. Hence comes the development of the skin which is reactive to numerous environmental influences. In the course of evolution the primary skin-layer has become specialized in different organs of the body: the eyes are simply specialized parts of the skin. The taste buds, the olfactory organs, and, at any rate, a large part of our ears, have the same origin. Thus the original reactions to pain away back in the early stages of evolution have led through the complex processes of untold millennia and innumerable natural "experiments" to the development of specialized organs, with their specialized reactions which bring their possessors into contact with a world of indescribable complexity and beauty. The contacts are of such a quality that they become essential to the full life of the organism, especially of man.

It is difficult to see how this can be accounted for in any way on the mechanistic hypothesis; whereas the sense of purpose seems to lie so closely at hand, postulating will and choice in the Creator.

This is perhaps not the place where one should attempt a discussion of the relation between pain and sin. And yet that there is a connexion, probably far more deeply lying than it has been fashionable to consider appropriate in the last few decades, seems to be implied in the sense of the appropriateness of punishment for sin. However sin may be defined theologically, it is something detrimental to well-being, both from the physical or individual point of view, and then also from the moral or social point of view, and, finally, from the spiritual or cosmic point of view.

Hence there is, on the whole, a mental reaction to sin parallel to, if not at bottom connected with, the physical reaction to pain, and it might be felt that the reaction which we have to sin and evil generally is another aspect of the same teleology which we have been just considering in connexion with pain as such.

Again, whatever else pain may be, it is certainly a stimulus. It means that the natural inertia and equilibrium of the individual is attacked, and must be overcome. This leads, on the psychological side, to certain consequences. Pain is obviously at the root of fear, and so of respect and awe. Pain, or rather the stimulus which comes from pain, suggests that kind of response which we know as will, and, especially, will as over against inertia. Will itself is a creative activity, and is teleological in character by the nature of the case. Moreover, the fact of pain easily leads to the development of foresight in anticipation of what will give us pain, as seen so frequently in the animal world, no less than in ourselves. Anticipation in any form, or foresight in general, is surely closely related to intelligence. And since there is this close connexion between pain and different psychological qualities—a connexion which makes their origin so easy to understand, and their development so urgent—one may be excused for asking whether we may find here the purpose of pain itself, and, if so, whether from the simple fact of pain and the immense consequences which have grown from it, we have not further light thrown upon the character of the Creator. Certainly we are not far away from the gospel which proclaims victory through suffering.

It is possible for us to press this general consideration further; for pain, besides being a stimulus, is also a challenge, *i.e.*, it carries with it the

quality which calls for its conquest. The conquest of pain means gathering of forces within the creature. It means ungregarious creatu planning and organizing for mutual protection; the development of sim or complex powers and means of attack. This may take place merely the physical plane, or it may take place on the lines of organizing the ent individual to overcome what is painful, mentally or physically, *i.e.*, wh causes actual suffering or what is merely hateful.

These considerations, taken in conjunction with the anentropic or co structive character of the biological process, seem to me to be of t highest significance. For apparently in the fact of life itself working in manner diametrically opposed to the ordinary physical processes; in t fact of the will developing under the stimulus of pain, and of intelligen which seems to be of the same origin, we have a sense of constructivene and of design reflecting something of a personal character in the univers and beyond any universe which is sensible to our ordinary sense-organ And I think that it is an attractive suggestion which Dr. Newsholme, Birmingham, has recently put forward, that we find in Christ a concentra tion of this constructive force acting as His will, or rather His will is th focusing of these constructive forces, enabling Him to overcome th inertia and entropy of nature, and so perform the different miracles ascribe to Him which are historically valid. In other words, it is within th horizon of possibility that a right understanding of biology will enab us truly to evaluate, if not fully to understand, the miraculous element whi is of the essence of all true religion. If this is the case we have in the fa of pain and the consequent physical and mental reactions and developmen a profound indication of the character of the Godhead, and of t personal teleological quality of His work.

(d) *Goodness*. Here I return from somewhat venturesome speculatio to others which are perhaps more in place. I have already drawn attenti to the perfection which is to be found in the smallest things, and one m find there a reflection of the character of the Godhead, or, at least, som thing which is harmonious with that doctrine. I am not at all certai however, whether this is a very cogent argument from the biological sid although it has a strong human appeal.

There are considerations that suggest that the small things are w able to look after themselves, and if the doleful dinosaurs of the geologi secondary period were still at large, I do not know whether our sportsm would be in as much fear of them as of sitting on a wasp. I doubt wheth one could find more signs of care in the perfection of the small than in t perfection or provision which is made for things which cannot be class mathematically. But there does seem in nature, at least among the high animals, a concern for the weak. What else is the meaning of the whol Mammalian class and the functions of motherhood which are attached to it Again, the sense of trustworthiness as constitutive of animate nature i brought home by the frequency of faithful mating amongst birds an mammals, none the less than by the consistency of the operation of th instincts.

Again, altruism seems to be built into the structure of the animat system, where one finds a concern for the whole in each individual cell of complex organism. General Smuts draws attention, rightly, to the signi ficance of the healing power which an organism possesses when wounded and the way in which individual cells in such cases adapt their energies an display their resources in order that the whole may benefit from thei activity. No cell, indeed, it may be averred, works merely for itself, eac works in its place and to its degree for the whole. When this physica

tradition becomes translated, owing to the stimulus of pain or to any other factor of consciousness, into a mental tradition, we have at least the beginnings of that altruism which is one of the finest qualities, and the last to be developed, in the spiritual life of man.

(e) And this brings me to my last point. It may seem almost impossible to obtain any indication of the *holiness* of God from our survey of animate nature; but we must remember that man is himself a part of that nature, and is one of the principal clues to understanding it. We cannot fully study the self-revelation of God biologically, apart from man as an animal who shares with the rest in the reactions with which they adjust themselves in various degrees to their environment, and so live their lives. All these phenomena are collateral with, and dependent upon, a physico-chemical activity of like nature in man and the lower animals. Further, our reactions, instincts, intuitions, and reasons are to be found in animals in a lower or higher degree. There is no essential difference in kind, although there are marked differences in quality and balance. The fact that there is this difference, and that it is just this difference which leads to the highest types of life of which we are aware, seems to indicate an end which has been purposed.

It is remarkable that man, who is the crown of physical evolution, is also the one who crowns the functions of instinct, intuition, and reason by some consciousness of, and relationship with, a world which is beyond this world, and with a personality which human personality only seems to adumbrate. There is surely something more than a mere fatuosity in the ancient cult of the Roman Emperor, for, after all, there is no more complete revelation of Deity than what might be found in a great man. A well balanced, strong, versatile, and elevated character is still the noblest work of God, but his characteristics cannot be understood apart from their biological basis of a complete and intimate adaptation to circumstances and their constructive power and beyond them.

These facts seem to point directly out of the biological sphere into that which is more specifically religious. A religious organism, if one may use the term, is one which responds (1) to the mechanical physical impulses; (2) then to the spatial co-ordinated impulses of a biological character; (3) to the time relations of a conscious organism; and (4) finally to that environment which is equally essential to man as man, namely, to those impulses which are beyond both space and time—love, goodness, beauty, truth, and obeisance before the divine. Man cannot be understood if we neglect his purely biological side, nor can it be understood in what way he is a new species of being unless we take this whole environment back of him into account. It offers a higher interpretation where the lower falls short, and seems to me directly to indicate the holiness of the Creator of all.

THE SELF-REVELATION OF GOD IN HOLY MEN.

By the Rev. Frank Lenwood, M.A.

1. *The Beginnings of Religion Depended upon Human Co-operation.*

My subject compels me to follow Canon Raven back to the first origins of religion. In the attempt to understand these, we are driven to conjecture. All germinal life is mysterious. When religion first began, no man of trained mind was present, and, if he had been, the half-animal beings

who were discovering religion would not have been able to let him s what their experience was, how it arose, and what were its stages. B religion is all of one piece, and taking this into account and using wh we know of primitive tribes, of our own childhood, and of certain su conscious activities of our minds to-day, we can form a working theo of the way religion arose. The historical stages of its development w also throw a light backward to its source.

The first genesis of religion must have been a sense of some unusu factor in experience. With part of his environment man felt himself home and reasonably competent to meet its demands, but there wer regions in which he seemed to detect special influences which he did no understand, influences which at once awed and excited him. I do n know any better word for these influences than Otto's—" the numinous " The capacity to be sensitive to this was a datum of human nature, jus as much a datum as the instinct of sex, and even more closely parallel t the instinct for beauty. The range of numinous experiences was at firs very wide. To man in the earlier stages almost every process of natur seemed mysterious and awe-inspiring. Little by little he came to under stand many of these phenomena, or at least to rely upon their regularities and therefore to feel at home with an ever-increasing number. A residue however, remained that defied all ordinary explanations, and refused t be classified in regular sequences of cause and effect. (I do not, of course mean that primitive man would have defined his thought thus.) This ine plicable residue was "numinous". In it I think God revealed Himself He was not, of course, in any burning bush, but the impression made o the shepherd was God, for it filled his mind with the sense of awe presence of mystery. The mystery may later prove to be no myster but the awe, once learnt, can be transferred to more genuine objects faith. Those who do not like to admit a genuine manifestation of Go in the early stages, if they believe in a manifestation of God at all, mu define the stage at which God did begin to manifest Himself in experienc of wonder. God certainly is there in the later stages; and I have no dou He was there in the earlier stages, though the manner of His presen is more difficult to comprehend.

We may anticipate by saying that, at the point of evolution we ha reached to-day, we can look back upon a gradual progression of knowled which has reduced the area and quantity of the numinous, but that o fullest knowledge still leaves a residue that defies ordinary non-religio explanations. Though that residue is restricted in area and quantit its quality is enhanced out of all recognition. The numinous, that is say, is just as certainly as ever an important factor in our modern liv and seems likely to increase in importance as man rises higher.

But this early apprehension of the numinous was never a purely indi vidual achievement. It is obvious that the growth of the idea must hav depended on the power of communicating to the children's generation th ideas which the parents had agreed to accept. The child of the secon generation began his apprehensions of the unseen world with certain pre judgments derived from the teaching of his elders. He was not compelle to start over again unaided, and make all the discoveries which his fathe had made and fit savage hypotheses to them which might or might no coincide with those of his father. On those terms progress would hav been impossible. The child was dependent on the opinions of those elder whose opinions he thought worthy of respect. In that respect you hav the beginning of the reverence for holy men.

Another tendency was at work, and even earlier. What one generatio transmitted to the next would as a rule be an agreed explanation. Her

and there, of course, there would be an Athanasius *contra mundum* dressed in a fragment of skin and able to defend himself against the majority with a club and a stout arm. But even his theory would have to secure adherence in the next generation or two, if it were not to perish in oblivion. Even for the most individual of pioneers agreement was an ultimate necessity—as later for the most revolutionary. How then did one generation reach agreement? By the triumph of the more influential theorists who succeeded in persuading the rest to adopt their theory.

When children are playing, one suggests that a tree with branches handy for climbing is the rigging of a pirate ship. If he has influence enough to carry it off, the rest will acquiesce and the tree becomes a pirate ship by general consent. Someone must make the suggestion and must have influence enough to secure support. It was the same in the primitive group. Suppose that Longhead came back to the cave to say that in a certain tree at the mouth of a gorge he had seen the leaves rustle in a curious way as he approached, that he was sure there was " a breath ", and he was desperately afraid. The others might return to the half-gnawed bone saying, " Old Longhead was always seeing breaths and hearing them ", or some of them might get up and go to see the eerie tree. If, like Longhead, they felt a mastering sense of its eeriness, it would become a shrine, and the oak might develop into the famous, mysterious oak of Beersheba or of Mamre, or perhaps, when the oak itself had long disappeared, the place might become Bethel, the House of God.

Or take again the creation of a taboo. Imagine that there was a general sense in the group that the greedier members were consuming the roots of one valley too quickly. Longhead might start the theory that " the breaths " would bring trouble on any man who dug roots in that valley for the next three moons. If the rest accepted the theory, and allowed Longhead to tie a warning string of fluttering leaves across the only two tracks into the valley, you would have the beginning of a law of moral conduct.

Perhaps sex relations a little too promiscuous were leading to quarrels and weakening the tribe. Longhead might suggest that " the breaths " would bring misfortune on sexual connexion between men and women of the same clan or family. If the rest accepted the theory, it would become a working rule of tribal life, and indeed of morality.

Behind all such agreements there lies personality, sometimes the personality of a group whose minds worked concurrently, but much more commonly the personality of an outstanding individual with apprehension beyond the rest. In any case, without the influence of personality there could be no fixation of achieved belief at the stages when it became needful, and no establishment of what might be transmitted to another generation. To say this is only to say that the laws of the growth of ordinary knowledge were valid for religion also. The pioneers of discovery in the physical world had their parallel for the world of religion in holy men.

For religion, as for all other knowledge, the fixing of the terms, however crude, and the framing of a theology helped to increase the quantity and quality of numinous experience. Here again co-operation is evident. These terms were first fixed under the impulse to share experience and conviction with others. It was the leaders who began to define. In doing so they enriched their thought as a similar attempt enriches our thought to-day. As they defined, they revealed, first by expressing what they themselves had experienced; second by putting their fellows in a position to experience more. They taught men what to look for, they set

men a step nearer to spiritual discovery than they could have mounted by their individual effort. Corporate sensitiveness and investigation defined the meaning of the object of the sensitiveness which they all felt in varying degrees, made it possible to transmit the conceptions to following generations, and started each new generation a stage further on in the task of investigating spiritual realities. You can only reach an assured experience of God with the aid of men.

2. *In all this God Plays His Part.*

In writing thus I may seem to suggest that men's knowledge of spiritual things depends entirely upon their own effort and that all the advance they make is due to the natural variation of spiritual ability in the species, *i.e.*, that one pioneer finds more of God than others because his mental or spiritual equipment varies in that direction. This fact of variation undoubtedly plays a large part in spiritual as in other branches of evolution. Is it, however, sufficient to account for the phenomena we know? Where does God come in? Does He merely sit there for us to apprehend Him? Does our evolution of ideas so that they correspond more and more closely to His nature explain all the growth of our knowledge of Him—as, for instance, it does in our knowledge of geology? If the answer is Yes, then there is no place for revelation in the ordinary Christian sense, since God plays a passive and not an active part. This is, of course, just one form of the wider problem whether God leaves us to our own free will without qualification or manages to keep a formative influence upon us that guides our lives without trenching upon our essential right and power of decision. I think in this case at least the answer will be found when we remember that religion is a contact of persons with a Person. Our discovery of God, therefore, is not a one-sided investigation of certain impersonal phenomena proceeding from the impassive object of our contemplation; it involves the interplay of two personalities who give themselves to one another. No man can reach full friendship with another unless the other is co-operating and is prepared to give himself. I believe it is the same with God; as we approach Him, He approaches us. Draw nigh unto God and He will draw nigh unto you. Our approach is never the discovery of an unresponding object, it is the interplay of willing personalities. In so far, too, as God is more loving than we, we infer that His seeking for us is more generous and passionate than ours for Him—to put it crudely, that He comes further than half-way. One advantage of the illustration of friendship is that in the interplay of friendship you attain a knowledge of your friend far more complete and accurate than you could attain by the cleverest processes of historical and psychological investigation. So friendship with God produces fuller knowledge of Him than do hours of discussion.

We may assume then all the way through that our increasing knowledge of God is the result of an increasing co-operation of free and willing personalities. On the one side is the one great personality stretching out His hands to us. On the other is humanity by turn corporately and by turn individually—often both individually and corporately together—stretching out its hands to God.

One more caution about the use of the evolutionary idea. I do not mean that evolution goes on of itself with or without some sort of initial push-off from the hand of God; I believe that God has been in the evolutionary process guiding and controlling it, and that it would have been impossible without that guidance. Incidentally, I believe also that at the stage of evolution we have reached it is possible for us in a new way to co-operate consciously with God, and that from this co-operation there

may come unimaginable results for the future of the race. I owe the thought, though not the religious form of the expression, to Julian Huxley.

3. *God is never apprehended as in Pure Isolation. We must apprehend Him in His relation to our fellows.*

One more reason why our religion is mediated through our fellows. Since, for " Greats " in Oxford, I read Martineau's *Types of Ethical Theory* and learnt from Rashdall's lectures to modify Martineau's idea of individual moral intuitions, I have been sure that ethics was founded upon our relation to God. I am confirmed in this by my inability to find satisfaction in other theories put forward to explain the origin and content of ethical obligation. I believe that our relation to God is the fundamental fact of our existence, and that this involves the sense of demand or of attraction, which we can only refuse at the price of sterilizing something central in our human nature. God is always drawing us and we only fulfil ourselves as we freely accept the drawing and attempt from our side to approach Him. " Thou hast made us for Thyself and our hearts can find no rest till they find it in Thee". The demand, that is to say, is inherent in that which lifts our human nature above the brutes. Free human personality meets with free divine personality, not merging in the pantheistic sense but as in friendship or marriage uniting and at the same time finding in difference the glory of their union.

But this relation of my personality to God involves at once—I think inherently—a relation to other personalities. We may put it in various ways. We may say that we feel that God's Fatherly relation to me, His child, obviously extends to other children; I am therefore bound to love those He loves—my fellows around me. My love to them is an aspect of my love to God. " He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God Whom he hath not seen? " Again, we may remind ourselves that we can only draw near to God as we become progressively like Him. Likeness of ideal is essential to fellowship. Only in so far, then, as we share in the mind of Him Who, to take one instance applied to one particular problem, sends His rain on the evil and the good and makes His sun shine on the just and the unjust, can we be " mature " (*teleios*) and fitted for relation with Him. Or starting from the fact that the early apprehensions of the numinous connect it with the conception of personality, we may say that our reverence for His personality involves reverence for all personality wherever we find it. Schweitzer goes further and bases ethics on respect for *life,* and his principle is parallel. These methods of approach all come to the same point; that the attraction of God lays a demand upon us and that we fulfil that demand in two ways, in personal communion with Himself and in a relation with our fellows. Therein lies our ethical obligation. The theory also explains the detailed content in which the obligation must work itself out. All that is involved in that relation with God and his fellows, primitive man understands in the most primitive and infantile way. Different stages of later civilization have reached different stages of understanding, and therefore their codes are different. Hence we find no perplexity in those local and temporal differences of moral conviction which make it impossible to accept Martineau's theory that each moral duty is the result of a separate moral intuition. We are all the time moving—alas! so slowly, though yet moving—towards that far-off divine event, the revealing of the sons of God, when our brotherly relation to our fellows will correspond with and be worthy of God's love to them as Father. To summarize: ethical obligation is a part of our fellowship with God, and the working-out of that obligation in the details of moral life is essential to

the expression of that fellowship. You might almost say that for working purposes (a) morality and religion are inseparable, and (b) that God is not to be regarded in isolation, but that we ought always to think of Him as God *plus* the children of His love. He is not truly God in isolation—at least we never reach Him so.

The relevance of this theory of ethics is that our relation to God and our relation to man are always reacting upon each other. Some men begin from the Godward end and from that work out their duty to man. Others begin from the manward end and work towards a fuller relation to God. The manward beginning is hallowed by the example of Jesus in many of the parables. A modern instance of the reaction of ethics on theology may be found in the development of the modern science of punishment. The insistence upon the reform of the individual—the great object of many of our prisons—makes it impossible to hold some old theories of atonement, and indeed reacts upon all our thinking about atonement.

The seer who reveals God by helping men to feel the numinous is not the only type of holy man. There is the second type, who works out and lives out the reform of human relations and thereby makes men more sensitive to the appeal of God. There are the mystics who have tended to concentrate on God, and the ethical pioneers who have sometimes seemed to ignore communion with God as they pressed for righteousness in daily life; and both were holy men, revealing God. The character of the holy man reacts upon the contemporary understanding of the idea of God.

4. *As we Evolve the conception of Holiness in God, so we Evolve the conception of the Holy Man.*

Otto shows that the numinous in its earlier manifestations is only partially moral. To primitive man the unseen factor in his life is at first mainly powerful and terrible; " tremendous " in the literal Latin sense—something before which one trembles. Its working is capricious; man must not seek to justify its ways. It is for this reason that Otto is compelled to define the word "holy" in its early uses by the word "numinous". "Holy", to the early makers and moulders of language, spoke far more of the effect of the unseen spirit upon the recipient worshipper than of the character of the spirit itself. Throughout the ages the numinous element continues—the sense of awe and mystery is not lost—but gradually alongside it there grows up a moral interest in the nature of the deity. One side of the history of religion is the history of the moralization of the idea of God. As the idea of God changes so the word "holy" takes on a new content, until the mere thought of the numinous (though still present) is thrown into the shadow by the radiant idea of moral purity. Step by step with the evolution of the idea of God goes the evolution of the word holy as it is applied to God.

There is a parallel evolution in the word as applied to man. The witch-doctor who stood for the numinous in the cannibal village might quite well be a person of immoral life. Even in a country as advanced as India I have heard students argue that Krishna must be a god because of the colossal scale of his immoralities. Like master, like man. At such a stage the moral character of the holy man is irrelevant. The one question is whether he sufficiently illustrates the terror and threatening vengeance of the spirit he represents. We may assume that evolution went on more or less concurrently at the manward and Godward end—I mean that by movements of thought sometimes independent in origin but almost immediately beginning to play upon each other, the demands for character in

God and for character in man made their advance together. At the stage of the journey we moderns have reached, men have a higher standard of holiness for men, as they have a higher conception of the holiness of God. Both standards, we may be assured, will continue to advance, and they will do so in co-operation.

As humanity grows more sensitive to the moral elements in the character of God, so it demands that the men who speak in God's name shall have characters corresponding to the higher conception of Him of Whom they speak. He who acts as God's agent must display God's character. The people content with an unworthy priest must lack something of the sense of the character of God.

In the beginning the young witch-doctor who did not inspire terror would be a sort of " stickit minister ". No village would support him if he could not exhilarate them by giving them fits. At the other end of the scale the man of God is a failure if he does not reveal in his own personality something of the holy love of God. At that upper level any deficit of personal character reacts upon his message. " Physician, heal thyself " is a retort no religious leader can disregard. It is for this reason that the moral character of the priest varies up and down with the spirituality or externality of the religion. The Romanist, with his belief in transactions in the sacraments, can discuss the problem whether the unworthy character of the priest invalidates the sacrament. The man of more spiritual religion would hesitate to discuss the theoretic question because he would feel instinctively that it was impossible to separate the influence of the service from the influence of the minister. He would not be prepared to say that the sacrament was ineffectual—indeed about that he would probably say very little, but he would do his best to remove as rapidly as possible an obstacle that blocked, if it did not completely choke, the channel of the divine grace. Though we may pant breathlessly far behind the immense demand involved, it remains true that the priest must be like his God. *Be ye therefore mature in goodness as your Father in heaven is mature.*

5. *It is therefore natural and right that most of our revelation of God should come through man.*

All this is the justification for those who, like myself, find that their occasions for direct and mystical communion with God are far fewer than those that come to us as we are lifted into the presence of the goodness of men. For my religion I am extraordinarily dependent on others. I imagine the same is true for most other people. I believe it to be one of the most beautiful ordinances of God. Moffatt gives us a new rendering of the story of Moses and his communion at Sinai: " The Eternal came down in the cloud and Moses placed himself there beside him ". How is that for a classic expression of the daring confidence of the really holy man? After that it is not surprising to read further that " Moses did not know, as he went down from the mountain, that his face was in a glow after speaking with God ". Those vivid phrases go a long way to explain why Moses was regarded as the founder of the religion of Israel. The whole story may be a Hebrew myth, but it contains that principle of communion which guides a noble succession of historic prophets. Or there is Amos, ethical by temperament rather than mystical, standing before the royal shrine in Bethel and speaking in Jehovah's name for pure worship, and righteousness that should roll down as a mighty stream. I think of Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, the great author of *Second Isaiah,* and I think of the summary in *Hebrews* 11, the influence of the heroes of faith. As

I must not trench on the next paper I leave out Jesus, though of course in the personal revelation of God he is supreme. I pass on through the centuries to think of hero after hero of the Christian faith and to recall what they have meant to my religion. I think notably of dear Francis of Assisi and of Henry Drummond, to whose biography I owe so much.

Nor are they only Christian heroes on this list. Typical is that old Jewish saint Akiba who was being put to death by torture

> when the hour came that every pious Jew repeats the Shema, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul". He recited as far as "with all thy heart", and then stopped and smiled. "How", said one of the bystanders, "can you smile when you are dying in agony?" "Every day", he replied, "have I repeated these words, and I could say without hesitation that I loved the Lord with all my heart, but to say that I loved him with all my soul, that is to say, with all my life, was hard, for how can a man say what he has done with his life before the day of his death? But now that the day of my death has come and the hour for repeating the Shema has returned, and I have loved the Lord my God with all my heart and with all my life, why should I not smile?"

Or take again Tuka Ram, the contemporary of Milton (a thoroughgoing Hindu, though I suspect that scraps of the Gospel had floated his way, perhaps from the Roman Catholics of Western India), recently translated by J. S. Hoyland :—

> When thou art plunged in hurrying activity,
> Then, then pre-eminently,
> Thou must remember God.
>
> Then in the midst of busy work,
> Keep thou thy secret heart fixed firm on Him.
>
> The kite flieth high in the heaven,
> And the boy is busy below,
> But his secret heart is on high, with his kite :
>
> A woman who beareth water from the well,
> Walketh busily on,
> Her eyes are set on the path,
> But her mind is intent on the water she beareth :
>
> A man who hath buried his treasure afar in the forest,
> Liveth his life in the town, amongst men and things,
> But his heart is ever in secret there with his treasure.

Or again another :—

> The father, in love for his child,
> Addeth coin to coin :
>
> Though he starve, he will go on saving,
> Not for himself, but for him he loveth :
>
> For him he beareth the burden,
> For him he is bowed in the toil :
>
> And at last he giveth his son
> Great treasure,
> He adorneth him richly, with gems :
>
> He defendeth his child from all evil,
> He will give his own life for his sake :
>
> And art Thou, O our God,
> Less generous, loving and good,
> Than he ?

Such men are there to remind us that God has been and still is revealing Himself in holy men of other faiths than ours.

I think too of the times when some sudden flash of goodness or some breadth of sympathy or some costly forgiveness that I have seen in living men has sent me to my knees, of times when the glorious naturalness of some noble act moved me to rejoicing laughter, the laughter that leaps " as friend to meet a friend ", of times when after a period of unfaith I have been able to believe once more because of what I have seen in some great human life. You and I can think of friends in whose presence we are more sure of God, almost as men were when they companied with Jesus. Even when such friends are not present physically, the thought of them is a rebuke to sin and unfaith. Because we have known them we find we can believe that He is holiness and love. How it helps me to know the faith of a man I revere! How the prayer of a friend may lift me to the third heaven! Some men have a quality of life that brings eternal realities very close. In Cambridge it is well that we should remember James Stuart, Fellow of Trinity and Professor of Mechanics and Engineering, of whom another Fellow said,

> I don't know Stuart, I wish I did; but when Middlemore comes back from seeing him he looks as if he had taken the Sacrament.

Incarnation is God's great means of approach to men. Supreme as was His manifestation in Jesus, He was incarnate in men before Jesus came, and He manifests Himself so still.

Nor is He incarnate only in the great, in men of unusual personality and genius. Holiness is distributed in very democratic fashion.

> 'Tis Heaven alone that is given away,
> 'Tis only God may be had for the asking.

I see before me men and women in my church who awake in me that sense of vision, exultation, power, that comes from the highest experiences of God I know otherwise. Jesus apparently felt some emotion of the kind when he watched the widow casting her two mites into the treasury and thought of the dedication that underlay the act. A minister who will give to his people the power to express themselves, not merely in serving tables, but in the highest spiritual activities of the Church, will not for long have hesitations about the priesthood of all believers.

6. *There is a Priesthood of Personality.*

That phrase suggests to us that the priesthood of personality is more effective than any priesthood of ritual act. The revealing of man to God, which some regard as the function of the priest, can take care of itself. As for the revealing of God to man, there are two forms of priesthood in which I am interested, the priesthood of the prophetic office, and the priesthood of slow instruction. The priesthood of prophecy is pioneering upon the sacred way—about that we here shall make no dispute—and it is easy to know the prophet when we are far enough away from the hostility he provokes. The other priesthood, the work of consolidation and instruction, is no less a revelation of God; for part of this unveiling is in the commonplace drudgery and minor disciplines of life. " I come in the little things, saith the Lord ".

7. *The Church is the organic revelation of God in Holy Men.*

Thus we arrive naturally at the Church. The Church is the organization of God's self-revelation in holy men. We shall all here agree on the necessity of the Church for any developed or stable religion—witness von Hügel's story of Martineau and his agnostic enquirer which Henry Carter quoted in his Chairman's Address at Wolverhampton. Or again, " The

membership of a divine, spiritual community is necessary to the salvation of men ". I think that comes from Josiah Royce, the American philosopher. We all have so often to argue with people who assert they need no Church that the conviction is deep in our minds. But of late I have come to state it in a way new to me and perhaps new to some of you. I will put it in a material phrase, covering a spiritual truth. I see the Church as a society in which we hand out God to one another. You will not accuse me of hankering for transubstantiation if I use the illustration of our form of Communion Service. It is a beautiful thing to approach the Lord's table, as do the Anglicans, and have the officiating minister put the bread and the cup into your hands; but there is an equal beauty in the ministration of our deacons who as comrades go among their fellows giving them the elements which speak of the hospitality of God. What matter if their boots squeak sometimes, and their clothes are not always cut in the West End? They speak of the glory of the fact that in the Church lay people and ministers alike mediate God to one another.

I do not think you will find this mediation of God to one another, this priesthood of all believers, in any other religion. Certainly the idea of the mediation of God by holy men has sanctions that go near to the heart of our faith. Judaism began it when it spoke of God as " the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob ". Jesus hallowed it when he used the word " Father " so often to make his hearers understand the nature of God. (Even the slum child knows what a Father ought to be.) Later the author of the *Hebrews* was exceeding bold, and I think inspired beyond common measure, when of the men and women who dreamed of a heavenly country and ventured everything for it, he wrote, "Wherefore he is not ashamed *to be called their God*".

THE SELF-REVELATION OF GOD IN JESUS CHRIST.

By the Rev. A. C. Bouquet, D.D.

I am assuming two things:

(a) The historicity of Jesus.
(b) The appeal which He makes as
  (i) attractive;
  (ii) authoritative;
  (iii) acting ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ.

I imagine that (a) is pretty secure to-day. *"Hat Jesus gelebt?"* is not a question which even Bolsheviks answer with a negative.

I can imagine that (ii) and (iii) might also be accepted by a certain type of Communist and Positivist thinker as representing truth "expressed in the language of religious ideology". But to claim that Jesus Christ is the self-revelation of God involves a clear understanding of what we mean by the term "God". If we mean "the self-existent Universe", then we have again to ask, "What do I mean by 'Universe'?"—a question which Julian Huxley does not effectively deal with. Self-existence is the fundamental basis of the concept of deity, and what has been described elsewhere as the sense of the numinous is in reality the conscious realization of the self-existent as distinct from the conscious realization of the contingent[1]. We

[1] I refer you to Prof. Alexander's famous broadcast address of two years ago.

cannot divest ourselves of the idea of self-existence. It is an ultimate, and cannot be analysed into anything else without remainder. If, then, the historical Jesus be regarded as a piece of self-expression upon the part of Self-existent Being, of great attractiveness, authority, and importance—as is plainly the case—we have two points to consider :—

(a) Since Jesus is an emergent in the course of the cosmic process, what is the relation of pure Being to that process?

(b) What is the relation of Jesus to other pieces of self-expression upon the part of self-existent Being?

(a) has, I think, been dealt with in other papers at this Conference. My special task, therefore, is to consider (b). Is not the entire universe the unfolding of God's Being—His Word, as Kagawa says? Why limit incarnation as an activity to one human being, or even to *a* human being?

Now I venture to think that the problem, put in this form, points the way to its solution.

The problem before us is plainly the relation of the historical Jesus to other human beings, and, among those human beings, to holy men in particular. We have to explain in what sense Jesus is the self-revelation of Deity (1) in a way in which Casanova is not, (2) in a way in which St. Francis is not.

The answer I suggest runs somewhat as follows. Granted the universe is the unfolding of the self-expression of Deity, that self-expression spells freedom, and therefore delegated activity. Hence in that which is a mixture of obedience and rebellion the Divine purpose cannot be fully manifested. Divine initiative in one sense may be ever present, but as such it is mostly partial, and so far as it is delegated it is indirect, and increasingly indirect owing to the incompleteness with which the freedom of the individual is harmonized with the Divine purpose.. There is a most interesting passage in Spinoza[1] where, in answering a correspondent, he says that although Deity is the immanent cause of all things, still the Divine nature is not equally manifested in everything : there are degrees of perfection or reality.

> A mouse no less than an angel is dependent on God, yet a mouse is not a kind of angel.

And again :

> The wicked, it is true, do in their fashion the will of God, but they are not on that account in any way comparable to the good. The more perfection a thing has the more does it participate in Deity and the more does it express the perfection of Deity.

Two other passages may serve to round off the expression of his doctrine.

> The wicked knowing not God are but as instruments in the hand of a workman, serving unconsciously and perishing in the using; the good, on the other hand, serve consciously and in serving become more perfect.
>
> We can best understand the nature of the relation of Deity to the universe by considering, not stocks and plants, but the most reasonable and perfect creatures.

My argument would therefore be somewhat as follows : If, in ourselves, the element of self-determination rendering our behaviour morally unpredictable is the chief factor in differentiating us from God, then the surrender of the will is bound to release the Divine energy through the life of the human individual in proportion to the completeness of that surrender, so that the greater and more complete and more lasting the surrender the

1 Quoted by Pringle-Pattison, *The Idea of God*, 221-2.

greater does God's opportunity become for self-expression. This, of course, does not mean that all forms of perfect self-expression must necessarily be alike. There may, in fact, be a plurality of them, since the Divine self-expression is of infinite richness and variety. Also, it does not follow that an individual whose life is in some respects monstrous cannot in other respects display an inferior grade of perfection. In Arthur Fell's interpretation of Casanova we naturally admire the gay and debonair lightheartedness and the courage and resourcefulness of the Venetian adventurer. Though these manifest an inferior grade of perfection, yet on that level they are as perfect as they can be. What we find less admirable is the use made by Casanova of his gifts.

Similarly in the Fioretti what we admire is the transcending of worldly wisdom which makes Pietro Bernardone after his conversion so wonderful an instance of the maxim that a Christian is not simply someone who avoids doing the things that no decent person would do, but one who pursues an habitual course of conduct which no one would ever think of pursuing if he were not a Christian. The Christian is inspired to go out of his way ("beyond nature" is the phrase) to produce *flowers* of character[1]. Yet although we may admit with Tertullian and Justin Martyr that in some sense there were instinctive Christians before Christ, and that where the Buddha and the Chinese sages are most themselves and at their best, they are most like Christ, yet we are equally bound to admit that of Christians in general it may truly be said:

> All their radiance, all their glow
> Each borrows of its Sun.

Moreover, the self-expression of Pure Being may be not only by diverse portions and in divers manners, but also for divers purposes. It may be an expression of art, a communication of scientific truth through pointer-readings and classifications, or an explanation of the universe through philosophy. There is, however, the curiously pregnant phrase of Marx: "Philosophers have only explained the world. The task is to change it". There we see the Jew in contrast to the Greek. The Greek seeks philosophy, but the Jew world-transformation, and he is ready to court catastrophe and the violent discontinuity of revolution in order to achieve it. Christ is not the sage or philosopher, but flashes like a divine meteor through the mists of this planet. His brief but vivid earthly career is supremely an Act of God, forcing the course of human history with some violence out of the path which it might otherwise have taken.

Now if in the process of racial evolution an individual emerged whose will was to a unique extent surrendered to God, then the opportunity of Divine action would also be unique, and the actions of that life would be in a unique sense Acts of God, and one single culminating or critical action of such an individual would *ipso facto* be a crowning Act of God.

The objection to this theory must come obviously from the side of those who insist upon the "fallenness" of humanity. If it is said that there is not merely an unevenness and partiality about the harmonizing of human freedom with the Divine urge to express itself, but still more an actual taint of rebelliousness spread over the whole of human activity, how can any one individual who is a genuine emergent in the process of racial evolution exhibit a crowning Act of God? To say that this has happened is to make humanity its own saviour and uplifter. If it is said there was no intrusion into the cosmic series but only a release through one of its terms, what caused that particular term to act in this way? Whether the cosmic series

[1] Troeltsch says: "The Christian Ethic is not bred of nature, and it goes out beyond nature".

be fallen or only failing, why in this special instance should it have risen to the occasion?

The question is a fair one, and the necessity for its answer has led to the theoretical justification of a new line of humanity, deriving from a virginally conceived human being. Those who are satisfied with this answer have certainly a coherent scheme to unfold. But it must be borne in mind that many convinced followers of Jesus do not think the evidence sufficiently strong either for the total failure of humanity, or its total separation from God, or for the Virgin-birth, and therefore draw different conclusions and describe the status of the historical Jesus differently. As these differences are a delicate matter of the weighing of evidence, and not the fruits of wickedness or prejudice, it behoves both sides to avoid accusing one another of heresy.

We are offered, it would seem, two alternatives. Either we may recognize, as a recent writer has suggested, a hierarchy of ascending values, and then a sudden influx or intrusion of a new element from a wholly different world; or we may recognize, as others do, the same scale of ascending values, each term of the series marking the emergence of a new element, as it were within the series, until we reach the emergence of the historical Jesus, who, in spite of His uniqueness, must still be considered as a term in that same series. It is held by some that the latter of the two alternatives is incapable of satisfying the conditions imposed by the acceptance of the genuineness of the claims of the historical Jesus regarding Himself. Thus one eminent ecclesiastic writes that the figure of Jesus Christ can only be reduced to the position of "fitting in" with the process of history, if it be first mutilated. He says[1]:

> The more we study Christ in comparison with other religious leaders, the clearer does his uniqueness become. We do not "explain" him by putting him into the class in which he belongs, because if his status is what it appears to be he is not simply one of a class but stands alone as unique. The greater our knowledge of the preceding history and contemporary conditions, the more inevitable is the conclusion that he did not merely "emerge" from these as Shakespeare (for instance) "emerges" from Elizabethan England. To take one point only—nothing could be more foreign to the whole Jewish tradition than that a prophet should re-write the divinely given law, however much he might claim to be, not destroying, but fulfilling it in doing so. That sovereign act, and the complete absence of self-consciousness in the doing of it, present a wholly baffling paradox unless Christ is more than the greatest in a company of great spiritual leaders—unless he is in his own Person very God.

In order to do justice to those who accept the second of these alternatives it must be made perfectly clear that they regard this antithesis as a false one. They will not admit that it is impossible for the historical Jesus to be unique or sovereign unless He does something more than emerge as Shakespeare emerges. They would say that the fact of His emergence as a term in the series in no way affects His uniqueness. It will be well to let one of those[2] who holds this form of Christology speak for himself:

> The significance of Christ in a continuous scheme will be that he is the manifestation of the purpose or nature of the one world. It will be in terms of him that our world must be interpreted; he will be evidence for the nature of that world. Understood historically, he will have effected much of the best that has been in the world, and it could not have been if he had not been. But he will stand, not in contrast with the world-process, but as an exemplification of it. Remove him from the world, and the world would

1 Archbishop Temple, writing in "Theology and Overseas Missions", 1930.
2 J. S. Boys-Smith, *D Soc.* pamphlets, No. 3. (Bowes & Bowes.)

be other than it is, and would have a different meaning. Consequently, t suggest that he is superfluous, or has no place in theology, is entirely u justifiable. His significance remains, though its nature is altered; and h position in theology will still be dominant, though it will be a different pos tion. His place is in the world, and he is of the world, but only because th world itself is such that it has contained him and all that he means. Jesu you may even say if you please, belongs to the natural world; but not in th sense that, assuming a dualism of the natural and the spiritual, you the assign him wholly to the natural. There is no more room, in a continuou scheme, for a natural, in that sense, than for a supernatural, in that sens The degree in which Jesus transcends what is found elsewhere, I make n attempt to estimate; in principle, it could be as great as you pleased. Bu however great the element of newness or transcendence, his appearance o emergence in the world must be understood in the same sense as the emer gence of every other new element : it is no more an intervention, o catastrophic, than they. He is unique, not because he stands outside th process of the world, or enters it from beyond, but because of the fullnes with which he reveals its nature and meaning. If the term "Incarnation" is used, then we must say that incarnation, which is also the process of th emergence of higher forms, found in him its culmination, or at least a poin of culmination. It must, however, again be emphasized that this proces of becoming is not, as such, self-explanatory, but is in need of explanation and the explanation, though it must be consistent with process, will no necessarily be itself simply in terms of it. Moreover, it will in any case b impossible to interpret the higher in terms merely of the lower; the signifi cance of the whole process is revealed most adequately in its highest phases though incompletely even in them. Consequently, expressions like "incar nation" or "the self-manifestation of the eternal" may on the whole be mor adequate than those which, like "emergence" or "development", ar primarily descriptive of the onward process of the world : yet this is tru only so long as the two forms of expression are not regarded as mutuall exclusive or as referring to different series of events, but are understood a describing the same events from different, yet mutually consistent, points o view.

Another writer[1], belonging to quite a different Christian group, both intellectually and geographically, reaches a similar conclusion by an in dependent route when he says :

> The most obvious way to interpret Jesus is to think of Him as a revealing place for the eternal nature of things. When the electrical energies of th sun sweep through a balanced magnetic needle and swing it unerringl toward the pole star, we have more than a local event : we discover some thing absolute and universal about the nature of things. At a tiny point i space and time we know how the whole universe works in one aspect of it forces. So, too, in Christ we know something unique about the universe something we could not know without Him. We know that at the heart o the mighty frame of things there is Love and Peace, Tenderness and For giveness like that! The deepest word is not matter, it is Grace. Th movement of life is not toward futility and frustration, it is toward a new creation and the making of man in the image of Christ.

The suggestion which I venture to make is that we are not sufficiently using the category of discontinuity. We need, as T. E. Hulme once said to work equally with the categories of continuity and discontinuity, exclud ing neither. The sphere of religion equally with the sphere of biology has its discontinuities and its intenser moments which are not repeated, and which disturb the even course of cosmic process much as a village upon a high road disturbs the line of telegraph posts bordering on it, or knots the straight line of the road.

[1] Dr. Rufus Jones, at the Jerusalem Conference.

Relatedness, moreover, does not preclude the possibility of "spots and jumps", and what from our point of view may seem merely a piece of transilient activity within the cosmos may be from the standpoint of God an opportunity for something new and decisive to appear, for the purpose of manifesting Redemptive Love.

Of course, you may say that this, like many other Christological theories, is only another piece of rationalization—a prejudiced effort to keep the old dogmas by wresting the new terminology to make it fit them. I would reply that if I really thought that were the case, I would at once abandon the attempt to retain the uniqueness of Jesus. But I do not think that it is so. I think that G. K. Chesterton in his earlier phase was so far correct in saying that the tale of the appearance of Jesus was of a queer shape and that it fitted the world-process, just because that was a queer shape also. (I use almost his exact words.) Chesterton had, I think, seen and expressed in his own whimsical way what we are seeing to-day, that the relatedness and continuity of process in the cosmos can be exaggerated and over-emphasized, and that whatever criticism may say about the tale of the appearance of Jesus, it still remains, when criticism has done its work, a very remarkable sequence-group in the total course of events. I do not mean that the appearance of Jesus is irrational, but rather that it is irregular, and that we have made too much of the regularity of the cosmic patterns. Regularity is an appearance (I had almost said an illusion largely due to abstraction for purposes of classification. But *to leave out* special features in order to make the individual fit into a class, however convenient it may be for some purposes, invariably does injustice to the individual. What I hope we are now recovering is the sense of the uniqueness of each individual, and so the sense of the greater uniqueness of Jesus, a uniqueness which finds its best expression in what contact with Him is able to do for the individual life.

To sum up. The specific newness and uniqueness of the Divine Initiative in Jesus may then be said to consist in the revelation of Redemptive Love (shall I say of the voluntary acceptance of the Cross by Deity as the supreme part of His activity and supreme demonstration of His character?), so that things have never been the same with the universe, since Jesus, as they were before His historical appearance[1].

I venture to suggest that this is exemplified in the lives of the saints, not only as shown to us by Fr. Martindale, but by others also. I do not think Martindale has shown conclusively that the supernatural and heroic virtue of, *e.g.*, Peter Claver is really a monopoly of the Roman Communion. I find it equally displayed and honoured elsewhere. The story of Clifford Harris, "The Merry Mountaineer", who as a young C.M.S. schoolmaster in Persia lived so completely ἐν χριστῷ that even in his last death-bed delirium he gave away his coverlet to a shivering beggar; the tale told by Principal Oman of the minister of a congregation working on and literally "dying on his feet", and sending up to college a splendid stream of virile young ordinands—the careers of Coleridge Patteson, Florence Buchanan, Robert Moffat, Ernest Edghill, to take a few at random—these are all equally the fruits of the Divine Initiative in Jesus.

My final contention is therefore that even if we think of Jesus as thoroughly human, and consider His biography much as though we were Positivists, the discontinuity of His appearance in Judea, and His brief but startling career, together with His living and abiding influence in the spirit, tell us something about self-subsistent Being which astronomy, mathematics, and biological evolution, fascinating as they are, do not tell us.

1 I have since been reminded that this is C. G. Montefiore's independent judgment, as a liberal Jew.

Postscript.—In the course of the most interesting discussion with which my courteous and patient hearers rewarded me, three points stand out as to me, at any rate, of special importance.

1. Analogies to the *newness* of Jesus were given by those who spoke of Einstein and of the Shirley poppy.

2. The possibility of the *re-production* of Jesus was considered on the basis of the second analogy, and Mr. Lenwood very properly quoted "Greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto my Father". I would readily admit that, but yet reiterate,

> All their radiance, all their glow
> Each borrows of its Sun.

Without the prime Initiative in the great Figure of Galilee there could be no saints, though that Figure may yet be the First-Born among many brethren, and His followers the *extension* of the Incarnation, the pleroma of the Original.

3. The relation of the "new" Christology to the high doctrine of (let us say) *Ephesians* was raised. I suggest that having accepted the "new" Christology we should not actually forget it, but pass on from it to its implications. It *may* relate humanity to God in a new way, hitherto unrevealed to us, but yet it is God Who is affected by this revelation quite as much as humanity. Hence we may again take up the Pauline injunction, "though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet henceforth know we Him so no more". This much, at any rate, I am ready to learn from Karl Barth.